

# AMERICA

## A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XVIII. No. 17 }  
WHOLE No. 459 }

FEBRUARY 2, 1918

{ \$3.00 A YEAR  
PRICE, 10 CENTS

### Chronicle

**The War.**—After a period of relative quiet on the western front, operations were resumed during the week from Nieuport, where the French now hold the line, to the Swiss frontier. The movements *Bulletin, Jan. 22, a.m.* were nowhere of a major character *Jan. 29, a. m.*

but were everywhere marked by the intensity of the struggle. Northwest of Reims and on the right bank of the Meuse there was an intense incessant artillery duel. Heavy German raids repeatedly took place southeast of St. Quentin and north of Courtecon. The struggle on the Aisne front north of Souain and Avocourt was of a particular violent nature. The Germans claim that in this sector they took a considerable number of prisoners, while Field Marshal Haig reports that a German attack broke down at La Bassée, under the fire of the British batteries, and a French communiqué states that another German attack on the front of Chaume Wood, north of Verdun, was ineffective.

The most important event of the week is the withdrawal of the Austrians in the mountains of Italy, where they fell back on the west of the upper Piave from their strong positions on Monte Tomba to Monte Spinoncia.

As a result of the revelations concerning the manner in which military and economic preparations have been conducted by the President and the Administration, the

**The War Cabinet Controversy** Senate Committee on Military Affairs has prepared a bill whose main purposes are as follows: A War Cabinet is to be created, composed of three citizens of distinguished ability, to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, through which War Cabinet the President may exercise such of the powers conferred upon him by the Constitution as are described in the bill. The War Cabinet is to be superior to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy and all other officers of the Government except the President, its acts being subject to his review. Differences between Cabinet officers and other officials as to the conduct of the war are to be adjusted by the War Cabinet. No head of any executive of the Government is to be a member of this Cabinet. The bill does not provide that the President shall be a member of the new Cabinet or sit with it. The President is left to his own determination in this connection.

Senator Chamberlain of Oregon, who made charges

in New York that the Government had broken down in its war preparations, has officially repeated them in the Senate, adding, however, that he referred to the military preparations about which he contended that the President was misinformed. He also declared that he did not intend to attack the Administration, and proclaimed his loyalty to the country. In the array of evidence put before the Senate to prove that the military establishment had fallen down, Senator Chamberlain referred to the disclosures of delay in ordnance and equipment; of illness in the camps due, he alleged, to failure to create an adequate system, and of a failure in general to use the vast machinery of the War Department to put the country on a war footing.

The President, who had formally denied the charges of military inefficiency and had specifically upheld the official conduct of the Secretary of War, Mr. Baker, who has been under investigation by the Senate and is the storm-center of the controversy, does not seem inclined to suffer any curtailment of the rights and duties with which, in his capacity of Commander-in-Chief of the Army, the Constitution invests him. He is set against the War Cabinet bill, as well as the bill for the creation of a Munitions Ministry. As to the latter, in a note addressed to Senator Chamberlain, on January 11, and later made public by Senator Chamberlain, the President frankly expressed his disapproval. Not only, he said, would the results be disappointing and a dislocation of activities ensue, but even to attempt such a thing would greatly "embarrass the processes of co-ordination and of action" upon which he had spent "a great deal of thought and of pains," and which, he believed, were more and more yielding the results desired. Meanwhile, Mr. E. R. Stettinius of New York has been appointed by Secretary Baker as Surveyor-General for all army purchases.

The Belgian Government's terms of peace so far as they concern Belgium herself were set forth in her reply to the Holy Father's peace note on January 23. The

**Belgium and the Pope** terms are in substance, those outlined in the peace terms proposed by the Pope himself, absolute political, economic and territorial independence. In enclosing his reply, King Albert wrote the following personal letter to his Holiness:

Holy Father: I have taken note, with lively sympathy and interest, of the message your Holiness was good enough to send to the heads of the belligerent countries on August 1, and have hastened to submit it to my Government, which has studied it with most serious and deferential attention. The result of that study has been recorded in a note which I am happy to communicate to your Holiness. In associating myself with the wishes of the Holy See that a just and durable peace may promptly put an end to the evils from which humanity, and particularly the Belgian people, so sorely tried, are suffering, I beg your Holiness to believe in my filial and respectful attachment.

The reply of the Belgian Government is an official denial of the charge brought against the Pope that he neglected to protest against the wrongs done to Belgium by her invaders. On this point the note says, in speaking of the Holy Father's peace-message of last August:

At the outset of his message the Holy Father took pains to declare he had forced himself to maintain perfect impartiality toward all the belligerents, which renders more significant the judgment of his Holiness when he concluded in favor of the total evacuation of Belgium and the reestablishment of its full independence, and also recognized the right of Belgium for reparation for damages and the cost of the war. Already in his consistorial allocution of January 22, 1915, the Holy Father had proclaimed before the world that he reproved injustice, and he condescended to give the Belgian Government the assurance that in formulating that reprobation it was the invasion of Belgium he had directly in view.

The honest people of all countries will rejoice with the Belgian Government that the injustice of which Belgium was the victim and the necessity for reparation have been proclaimed, and that the highest moral authority of Christendom remains watchful amidst the passion and conflicts of men.

It was because of the gratitude felt on this account, which was augmented by the numerous charitable acts of the Holy Father in favor of so many Belgians, victims of the violence of the enemy, that the Royal Government has examined into the possibility of contributing in the measures depending upon it toward the realization of the double desire which inspires the Pontifical message: to hasten the end of the present war and render a return of similar catastrophes impossible by the adoption of guarantees destined to assure the supremacy of right over force.

"If there is a country," the note says, "that has a right to say it took up arms to defend its existence, it assuredly is Belgium." It then adds its peace terms as far as Belgium is concerned. They are as follows:

The integrity of Belgium, the territory of the mother country and colonies, political, economic, and military independence without condition or restriction, reparation for damage suffered, and the guarantees against a renewal of the aggression of 1914—such remain the indispensable conditions of a just peace so far as concerns Belgium. Any settlement that would not recognize them would shake the very foundations of justice, since it would forevermore be established that in international domains the violation of right creates a claim for its author and may become a source of profit.

With regard to the peace terms mentioned by the Central Empire in their reply to the Holy Father, the document states:

Since the Royal Government a year ago formulated its conditions, it permits itself to recall that the Reichstag voted resolutions called peace resolutions. The Chancellors and Ministers of Foreign Affairs have followed each other in the German Empire,

and more recently in the Central Empires, and have published notes replying to the message of his Holiness, but never a word has been pronounced and never a line written clearly recognizing the indisputable rights of Belgium, that his Holiness has not ceased to recognize and proclaim.

The message of King Albert and his Government is a clear statement of their conditions and at the same time a perfect vindication of the policy of the Pope with regard to the unfortunate country.

Count von Hertling, the German Chancellor, outlined Germany's peace terms in his address before the Reichstag Committee on Jan. 24. Commenting on the fourteen points in the program for world-

*The Hertling  
Peace Terms* peace set forth in President Wilson's address to Congress, the Chancellor

said that an agreement could be easily obtained on the first four points, *i.e.*, open covenants of peace, freedom of the seas, removal of economic barriers and establishment of equality of trade-conditions and reduction of armaments. Regarding the fifth point mentioned by President Wilson, namely, adjustment of colonial claims based upon the principle that the peoples concerned have equal weight with the interest of the Government, the Chancellor said that some difficulties would be met with. The sixth point, the evacuation of all Russian territory, he stated, concerned Russia and the Central Powers only. With regard to the seventh, the evacuation of Belgium, Germany, according to the Count, never intended to wrest Belgium by force or annex that country. The President's eighth point called for the restoration of all French territory and the righting of the wrong done in taking Alsace-Lorraine. The question of Northern France would be a question for discussion between Germany and France, said the Chancellor; but Alsace-Lorraine would never be given up. He added that readjustment of Italy's frontiers along lines of nationality should be referred to Austria, as well as the Balkan questions, the evacuation of Rumania, Serbia and Montenegro, and access to the sea for Serbia. The President, in his eighth point, demanded the sovereignty of Turkey's portion of the Ottoman Empire, security for other nationalities under Turkish rule and the opening of the Dardanelles to all nations. Germany rejects the open Dardanelles clause as endangering Turkey's existence. In answer to the American demand for an independent Polish State, Von Hertling declared that that question must be settled by Germany and Austria and Hungary. To the fourteenth point in the Presidential address, namely an association of nations for guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to all, the Chancellor countered by saying "a durable peace first and then discussion of the question of a league of nations." On the question of a general peace Count Czernin is quoted as having said in the Austrian Parliament that he considered President Wilson's peace propositions an approach to the Austro-Hungarian point of view, Austria however would fight to the end in defense of her alliance with Germany.

The Russian delegates to the Brest-Litovsk conference have unanimously decided to reject the final terms offered by the Germans, which are that Russia must give

*Other Items* up Courland and all the Baltic provinces, otherwise the Germans will resume military operations and occupy

Reval within a week. The question of peace or war rests with the Congress of Soldiers or Workmen's Delegates in Petrograd. Dispatches from Amsterdam on the other hand state that the German Chancellor, Count von Hertling, in addressing the main committee of the Reichstag on January 24, stated that he still held fast to the hope that the Brest-Litovsk negotiations would soon reach a satisfactory conclusion. He also declared that the German Government hoped soon to make an agreement with Ukraine "which would be mutually satisfactory especially from an economic point of view." The peace-strike in Austria, at first reported serious, has apparently been broken. According to the latest despatches the democratic movement in the Empire has received a great impetus which has been further emphasized by the Bohemian demand for self-determination pressed in the Vienna Parliament. On January 25 the New York *Evening Post* published the first instalment of the full texts of the sensational secret treaties between Russia and the Entente Allies, taken from the files of the Russian Foreign Office and made public by the Bolshevik Government in Petrograd. It is prefaced by Leo Trotzky's statement on secret diplomacy issued at the time of the first revelation of the documents.

**France.**—The law concerning the wards of the French nation is about to be put into execution; that is, the orphans whose father or mother, or the one on whom the children depended for support, has

*The War Orphans* fallen in the course of this war, or has been incapacitated by wounds received, or maladies contracted or aggravated by reason of the war, are soon to be adopted by France with a view to their protection, education and support. From the very beginning the law caused grave apprehension to Catholics. Recent developments have increased rather than relieved their anxiety. According to *La Croix*, there is grave reason to believe that the guardianship is to be employed as a powerful means of further laicizing the nation and of robbing French children of their faith. More than 1,000,000 children will be affected, and from official statements made up to the present it appears that no assistance is to be given children unless their families agree to their entrance into the *école laïque*. It is estimated that approximately \$40,000 are to be distributed each week at the direction of the members of the *Offices Départementaux*, of which the lion's share will probably fall to the *Oeuvre des Pupilles de la Nation*, whose sectarian character is admitted.

*La Croix* urges Catholics to do their utmost, towards the end of February, to secure the election of Catholics

wherever such places are to be determined by ballot, as members of the *Offices Départementaux*. If they succeed in doing this, although they will be in the minority and not in sufficient numbers to control the action of the members of the *Office Départemental* in their locality, which will be presided over by the prefect, usually a man of pronounced irreligious views, they will nevertheless have a considerable influence in preventing an altogether sectarian and anti-religious application of the law.

**Ireland.**—The country has been much disturbed during the past week. Craig, a partner of Carson in former opposition to a just settlement of the Irish problem,

*The Convention* resigned from the office of Lord Treasurer of the Household, stating that it was impossible for him to separate himself from the action Carson had taken.

The press has been speculating a great deal on the reason for the latter's withdrawal from the Cabinet. He says himself that he withdrew on account of the Irish question. The London *Daily News* suggests that Carson is desirous of bringing about harmony. The *Irish Times*, organ of southern Unionism, welcomes his "return to Irish politics at a most vital moment of his country's needs." Belfast Unionist papers take it for granted that the Ulster leader is getting ready to fight for Ulster's claims. The Manchester *Guardian* is of opinion that Carson intends to bring about peace in Ireland. Meantime the British Government is growing restive: it feels that a settlement must be reached in order to ensure friendship with the United States and to satisfy the British people who are weary of the struggle. It is suggested that if the Convention fails in its work, the Government will settle the matter in its own way. The London *Chronicle* refers to certain eventualities following the Convention which might induce Mr. Redmond to regard his retirement as obligatory, a calamity in the opinion of the aforesaid paper. On January 14 this official communication was issued in London:

At today's Irish Convention a letter from the Premier was read, stating that before the Convention arrived at a decision on certain issues under discussion he and his colleagues in the Cabinet would be happy to confer with the leading representatives of different sections of the Convention, should they desire to follow such a course. Thereupon it was decided to adjourn the Convention and certain members were selected to meet the Premier and his colleagues.

Sir Horace Plunkett, the chairman, was authorized to arrange the conference at the earliest possible date and immediately thereafter to summon the Convention.

Meantime while this was going on in Ireland, America was waiting for the outcome of the resolution that Miss Ranken introduced into our Congress, calling for the recognition of Ireland's rights. So far Congress has been silent, as have been both the President and Congress in regard to this petition presented to them by Mrs. Sheehy Skeffington:

We, the undersigned, representing a large body of Irish wom-

en whose president was condemned to death for her share in a struggle for the freedom of our country, make an appeal to you, and we base our appeal, first, on the generosity of the American administration in all things affecting women's lives and welfare, and secondly, on your recognition, many times extended, of the justice of Ireland's demand for political freedom. For many lamentable generations the women of Ireland have had to bring up their children in a country in a perpetual state of economic and political disarray consequent on its being governed in the interest of another country. Your declaration concerning a war settlement which has called into being and endowed with hope the spirit of democracy in every country, has made us feel that a new era is opening for us. Our appeal now is to remind you of a cause which should not be overlooked when so many European nationalities are to be reconstructed in accordance with your declaration. Our country, having behind it twenty generations of repression, has, we believe, a profound claim upon those who have declared their will to make the world safe for democracy. We appeal to you to recognize the political independence of Ireland in the form of an Irish republic. And encouraged by the knowledge that the States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Idaho, Washington, California, Arizona, Kansas, Nevada, Montana, Oregon and New York have granted full suffrage to their women, we feel that your generous sympathy will be extended to the women of our country in our demand before the world for the recognition of an Irish republic virtually in existence since April, 1916, the only republic which from its inauguration was prepared to give women their full place in the councils of their nation.

The petition was signed by ten prominent Irish women on behalf of the Irishwomen's Council.

**Rome.**—On December 20 a Republican Deputy, Signor Pirolini, in a speech delivered before the Italian House of Parliament, asserted that Mgr. Pacelli and Mgr. Tedeschini attended a reception given by

*Calumnies Repeated* the former's brother, at which Madame Caillaux was present. He also made accusations against certain priests of the Propaganda, the Jesuits, Colonel Repond, Commander of the Swiss Guards, and others.

The *Osservatore Romano* at once published an authoritative denial of the charges. Mgr. Tedeschini, in the columns of the same journal, repudiated the accusations by a personal letter, called attention to the malicious procedure of Signor Pirolini in repeating calumnies already denied and proved groundless, and declared that Signor Pirolini's intention could only be to involve the Vatican in a scandal at any cost. Referring to the accusation against Colonel Repond, he pointed out that it rested on letters supposed to have been written by the Colonel, but in reality forged, proof of the forgery having already been produced and the culprit punished. M. Ernesto Pacelli made a categorical denial of the statement made by Pirolini that Madame Caillaux had attended a reception in his house. He said he never knew or saw either Monsieur Caillaux or Madame Caillaux, and had never had any communication, direct or indirect, with them or any of their entourage. Father Tacchi-Venturi, Secretary of the Society of Jesus, at once wrote a letter to the *Giornale d'Italia*, proclaiming in unequivocal terms his love of his country,

which, he said, was second to none, and challenging Pirolini to adduce proofs in support of his attack on himself and his fellow-Jesuits.

Cardinal Gasparri, Secretary of State, sent the following telegram to Cardinal Amette of Paris:

Neither M. Caillaux nor Madame Caillaux nor Madame Lenouraud have ever been received at the Vatican by his Holiness or the Secretariate of State. It is likewise false that the Cardinal Secretary of State or any other prelate connected with his office has ever seen or met outside of the Vatican any of the persons mentioned, and not a single word has passed between them in writing. I deny unreservedly and categorically any information of contrary import and I protest against this campaign of calumny against the Holy See.

The *Irish Catholic*, in its issue of January 5, justly remarks that the incident calls for no comment. The Italian Premier, Signor Orlando, while addressing the House of Parliament on December 22, took occasion to deplore the attacks made on the clergy and the Catholic party as unjust and offensive to the supreme spiritual power and to the great mass of patriotic Catholics.

**Russia.**—After violent scenes in the streets of Petrograd the long-delayed meeting of the Constituent Assembly took place in the Tauride Palace on the afternoon of January 18. The Social Revolutionists elected as Chairman, M.

*Constituent Assembly Dissolved* Tchernoff, Minister of Agriculture

under the Kerensky Government, defeating Maria Spiridonova, the Bolshevik candidate, by a vote of 244 to 151. The Chairman announced that the Assembly would immediately call a conference of the Entente Allies to consider war-aims. The Bolshevik minority urged, however, that the authority of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Government be first discussed, but the motion was defeated. The Bolsheviks then asked for a two-hours' recess to consider further action, but only a half-hour was granted, and at the expiration of that period the Assembly began to discuss peace and land questions. M. Tseretelli, ex-Minister of the Interior, made a bold speech, sharply criticizing the whole Bolshevik policy, declaring that the country is now facing starvation, labor is in a state of collapse, and the peace conferences are fatal to the revolution. After scenes of disorder, during which Tseretelli's life was attempted, the Assembly hastily passed decrees awarding lands to the peasants and proposing to send delegates to all the warring nations. At 2 a. m. the Bolshevik delegates left the Assembly, two hours later sailors and red guards with fixed bayonets ordered the rest of the delegates to disperse, and a notice appeared on the palace door forbidding admittance. Premier Lenin subsequently announced that the Assembly would not be allowed to convene again. His decree of dissolution declares that the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils are the only organizations able to direct the struggle of the exploited laboring classes for complete political and economic freedom.

## Are Soldiers Martyrs?

J. HARDING FISHER, S.J.

THE new year finds the people of the United States firmly fixed in their determination not to shrink from the task they have undertaken. Every public manifestation makes it increasingly evident that there is a quiet, unobtrusive realization of the part, the tremendous part, which our nation is to take in making the world free for the enjoyment of the blessings of peace. The acceptance by Congress of the fact that a state of war exists between us and Austria; the reiteration by the President of our Government's unalterable determination to carry on the war to a successful issue, and his crystallization of the sublime purpose which is animating us in its prosecution; the thorough, if somewhat confused, way in which the economic, financial and industrial portions of our population are steadily but effectively adjusting themselves to war conditions, and the reliance expressed in foreign countries on the assistance which America is prepared to give in the struggle for peace—all emphasize the determination of our people to do their duty by the world.

To Catholics in particular the Christmas and New Year's messages addressed to them by their ecclesiastical superiors, and especially the greeting sent by his Holiness to the American people, have brought home with renewed force the need of courage for every sacrifice that patriotism may demand. That courage is most needed, perhaps, by our American mothers.

The thought of danger, as is natural, is not very often with the boy who dons the uniform. The hurry and bustle of camp life or active service leave him little time to think of wounds or death; but it is not so with his mother. All about her are reminders of her son; and as she comes home from bidding him God-speed in his country's service, she thinks of him out on the trackless courses of the sea or somewhere in France. For all her strength, especially in the silent watches of the night, she cannot keep love's visions, with their forebodings of peril, from rising before her mind.

In her moments of deepest desolation, in which there is no admixture of cowardice or regret but only silent generosity, the little mother who sits at home conjures up the worst, and then she turns to religion for consolation. She is certain that if her boy falls he will die a hero; she wonders if the Lord of Hosts will not gather him into His white-robed army of martyrs. If, she argues, like the Christians of old, he scorns earth's joys with its lures and its frowns, and treads the highway of blood and gives his life for his country's cause, what more is needed for a martyr's crown? Some such thought is seldom wholly absent from her prayers; it is constantly cherished in her heart; sometimes it trembles

to her lips in the question if death on the battle-field is not a species of martyrdom. Cardinal Mercier was asked this question on his return from Rome in the first half-year of the war, and other ecclesiastics in other parts of the world have had a similar experience. The question is a natural one; it was asked in the days of St. Thomas, it is current today.

No doubt it would be a source of much consolation to our brave American Catholic women who are sending their sons or brothers, their husbands or their betrothed, into the jaws of death, if they could be assured that the soldier's sacrifice of life, in a just cause, at the call of duty, is sufficient to constitute martyrdom with all its effects, remission of sin by the infusion of sanctifying grace, condonation of eternal and temporal punishment, and immediate entrance into beatitude. But a consolation which is built on error is a sorry one at best; real strength and comfort is to be found, not in pleasing delusions, but in truth. And the truth is that the soldiers who go "over the top" in the face of murderous fire, and, while "doing their bit" fall, never to rise, are not martyrs in the strict sense of the term, although they are martyrs to duty, martyrs to their love of humanity, and, perhaps, martyrs of charity.

To be a martyr in the canonical sense of the word, a sense which is accepted today and has prevailed since the fourth century, although before that time considerable latitude was countenanced in the use of the term, one must (1) suffer death or injuries of their nature apt to produce death, (2) in testimony to the Faith, and (3) without resistance. Applying these tests to those killed in the present war, we find that the first condition is assuredly fulfilled, the second is very doubtfully present, and the third is certainly absent.

Death for one's country, of itself, is not sufficient to constitute martyrdom, even though it be joyfully and heroically met in a worthy cause. The Church has not venerated as martyrs those who die in battle, not even the Crusaders. True, the supreme test of friendship is theirs, they deserve a place in the temple of fame, their names should be kept for a perpetual remembrance and inspiration by the nation for which they gave up their dearest possession, the Church calls them heroes and good men; but they are not numbered among the martyrs. The reason is clear: the essential conditions of martyrdom are absent.

One of these conditions is that the sacrifice of the soldier's life should be a public testimony to the Faith. Two elements are involved in such testimony: the attitude of mind of the one who suffers death, and the motive of the one who inflicts it; the former must submit to his

corporal suffering in order to be true to the principles of his Faith, and the latter must be actuated by hatred for the Faith.

As for the mental attitude of the soldier who suffers death, it is by no means inconceivable that it should be such as to constitute, so far as he is concerned, a real cause of martyrdom. That such should be the case, nothing more is required than that he should so transfigure and elevate his patriotism with supernatural motives and Divine charity as to bring it into direct relation with God. The sublime motives proposed to American soldiers in the present war are easily susceptible of such a transfiguration, and evidence is not wanting that it has been an actual and not infrequent fact. Nevertheless, this act by which the soldiers supernaturalize their sacrifice lacks the clear stamp of the special publicity required in the supreme witness to the Faith, for, so far as external appearances go, there is nothing to differentiate it from the sacrifice of many others who have no faith. Moreover, hatred of the Faith, as an actuating motive, is certainly absent from most of the battle-fronts. In no case can hatred be attributed on grounds stronger than conjecture.

But even if it were certain that the American soldiers dying on the battle-field were giving public testimony to the Faith, it still remains true that they lack the other condition of martyrdom. A martyr must be passive, he must make no effort to defend himself or to injure his assailant. Such submission is obviously out of the question in battle. So far from being a virtue, it would be a serious dereliction of duty; for the soldier, no less than his Government, must make every effort to reduce the fighting strength of the enemy and conserve the fighting strength of his own army; he is bound to do his utmost to render the foe ineffective; he must neglect no means of defending his own life, even at the cost of taking the foe's. This is his strict duty. If, therefore, he does his duty as a soldier he makes martyrdom impossible.

These are the reasons which led Cardinal Mercier to deny Belgian mothers the consolation of believing their sons martyrs; and yet he did afford them another source

of comfort, which is hardly less, when he assured them that he had no doubt that God crowns with eternal salvation the military valor of the soldier who consciously lays down his life in defense of his country's honor, in vindication of violated justice, and in the true Christian spirit. Such an act easily rises to the highest degree of charity, and a single act of perfect charity cancels a whole lifetime of sins.

A writer in the *Revue Pratique d'Apologétique* is of the same opinion. Speaking of France, he says that it is faith rather than patriotism which has sustained the victims, that their sacrifice and death have been made in the name of Christian principles, in the spirit of reparation, expiation and love of Christ. Grace, he says, is the source of their courage, charity towards God and their neighbor their principal motive, the Divine good bound up with the human good the end they propose to themselves. "For God, the Church and for France," is their glorious motto. Such men are not far from the Kingdom of God; undoubtedly they are offered and assuredly they accept the grace to die in the perfect love of God.

Even though they be in sin, when they receive the order to go forward, they will realize that this means looking death in the face, and will find, especially if they be Catholics, their minds turning to God and their hearts pleading for pardon. All that they need for forgiveness is to elicit an act of sorrow with perfect love for its motive. Who would dare say that God will not give the grace for this to those who are following in His footsteps and generously laying down their lives for their friends? Very few who have any faith at all would refuse to accept such a grace when they stand on the brink of the grave, and see the witchery of trifles fading away and the great light of truth illuminating the stern meaning of life. This is the consolation that mothers should lay to their hearts. After all, what more could a mother wish for her son than that losing his life he should find it; that dying in time he should live in eternity? It is the prayer she whispered over his cradle, it is the epitaph she should inscribe to his memory.

## A Benefit from the War

EBER COLE BYAM

**W**AR, terrible as it is, has its compensations in benefits that otherwise would not have been granted or, if granted, would have been ignored. This was clearly set forth in the remarkable Christmas message of his Grace, the most Reverend George W. Mundelein, Archbishop of Chicago, a message, by the way, that every patriotic American should read with reverence, no matter what his creed.

In addition to those cited by his Grace, there will come some benefits which, if recognized and properly employed, will afford an opportunity to guard against

the future for the protection of civilization. One of these benefits is the unmasking of the Socialists and their brethren the I. W. W. or Bolsheviks.

The varying degrees of Socialism reach almost into infinity, from that of the dreaming theorists to the I. W. W. Apaches, but the great majority of Socialists are more or less anxious to see the destruction, by violent revolution, of the existing social order, that upon the ruins there may be erected the cloud castles of their vaporous imaginations.

In times of peace the long-suffering good-nature of

the American people compelled a tolerance of the propaganda scattered by the Socialist I. W. W. "red-flaggers," and the more violent their ravings and the more exaggerated their self-evident lies became, the more the indulgent American smiled pityingly. Yet, insane and absurd as these fanatics have been in their mouthings, there have been multitudes eager to believe their absurdities and imitate their insanities. This might very well have brought about violence, and it may do so even yet, had not the United States entered into the world-war. This entrance into the war has compelled a separation of the sheep from the goats, and in this process we find the Socialists, the I. W. W., the Bolsheviks—they are really synonymous,—all actively engaged in aiding the enemies of America and its companions in arms.

The admission of Socialism to the ranks of the political parties of the United States was an act of folly comparable only to that of the farmer who warmed the viper in his bosom only to be stung to death by it. Fortunately for American civilization the war has shown the American people their danger; but, if they would avoid the fate of the farmer, they must crush the head of this Socialist-I. W. W.-Bolshevist snake now granted asylum in their midst.

That Socialists, I. W. W. and Bolsheviks are all of the same breed is being demonstrated with increasing clearness each day. If this could have been demonstrated several years ago, much misery might have been avoided. Russia is today entering into the same chaos that has oppressed suffering Mexico for several years. Indeed, it may be truthfully said that Mexico's history of nearly 100 years has been a continuous performance of Bolshevik anarchy under varying disguises of political camouflage.

The Bolsheviks and the I. W. W. are but twins and fit offspring of their infernal parent, Socialism. Since March of 1913 they have made, under various aliases, a very hell of Mexico, and are now plunging Russia into the same abyss. By its armed forces the United States Government intervened to enthronize the bewhiskered Bolshevik leader in Mexico, and, learning nothing by experience, it committed the insane folly of permitting the return to Russia of all the Russian Bolshevik-I. W. W.-Socialist scum that had sought refuge in American gutters. As a consequence of the first act, we are required to maintain a large army guarding the 1,800 miles of Mexican border, just that many less men to send to France; while, as a consequence of the second act, Germany can transfer 1,000,000 men to the west front and seize the food supplies of Russia.

The Bolsheviks have even had the audacity to send a ship loaded with arms and supplies to their brother I. W. W.'s in the United States, and, while the attempt to start a Bolshevik revolution here was a ridiculous failure, it must not be forgotten that the intent to do so was most infernally real.

Fortunately, the emergency of war has unmasked the

Socialist-I. W. W.-Bolshevist combination, yet, in spite of all this, it is announced that these apostles of destruction are to be permitted to enter the country and "preach their doctrine of government without hindrance" (Press dispatches from Washington in morning papers of December 26).

This "doctrine of government" is frankly one demanding the overthrow of our present form of government by violence, and it would repeat in the United States the same chaos and anarchy reigning in Mexico and in Russia.

True, the I. W. W.-Bolshevik-Socialists have been unmasked, but, unfortunately, too many Americans refuse to recognize the danger and prefer to dismiss it as but the fanatic viciousness of a few of the collarless and unwashed agitators. Collarless and unwashed they certainly are, but few, they as certainly are not, and among them there is found an occasional creature possessing not only education but wealth. Through some mental twist such find an impish delight in urging their many-headed companions to destruction.

Mr. William Bross Lloyd, announced as "one of the owners of the Chicago Tribune," published a letter in the Chicago *Examiner* on Christmas Day which is good evidence in support of the statements made in this article. Mr. Lloyd says, in part: "I want the people to join the Socialist party." That statement identifies Mr. Lloyd for what he is and the Socialist party for what it is. As to his attitude he says: "I'm a revolutionist. The only reason I'm against this war is that the United States aren't fighting the people I want to fight." In this he agrees with the Bolsheviks. Concerning his purpose Mr. Lloyd says: "I'm a revolutionist and I want to overturn and destroy the present capitalist system. . . ."

"Overturn and destroy" are his words, and thousands of the liquor-scented, unwashed radicals echo his cry and look forward to the day when they will be privileged to outrage and rob and ruin, even as in Mexico and Russia they have outraged and robbed and ruined. In these unhappy countries no woman's honor is safe, no man's life secure, while property is but something to be stolen or destroyed. That is the state of affairs Mr. Lloyd would establish in the United States. Mr. Lloyd and his unkempt following are in deadly earnest and it behooves thinking people to awaken to the impending danger.

One of the possible benefits accompanying this war is the elimination of Socialism. Let us hope that this benefit may be realized and that in its realization all the rest of the political Apaches may be cast into the limbo where they belong.

Autocracy is fighting democracy, Socialism is fighting civilization. Autocracy would make it impossible to enjoy civilization, but Socialism would destroy civilization altogether. Both are intolerable tyrannies inimical to the welfare of the human race.

## A Cure for Caprice

DANIEL A. LORD, S.J.

**R**OUGHLY considered, there are two general classes of moralists: the moralists who invent theories, and the moralists who live them. The second follow the first as inevitably as a tail follows a comet or a small boy a circus parade. There precisely is the danger of all moral theorizing. If every man were a hermit, living ten miles from his nearest neighbor and absolutely barred from communication with anything more human than a woodchuck, he might sit quietly, in the midst of the forest, spinning moral theories from dewy dawn to dusky eventide.

But moralists love solitude as much as they hate print. As soon as a moralist has gathered a dainty little handful of fantastic moral principles, he rushes furiously into a university or a publisher's office, blows a bugle, clangs a gong, and assembles the populace; whereupon, some pliant idiot takes the new teachings hot from the master's lips and plunges outdoors to try them on the neighbors. Why have the neighbors never thought of organizing a Home Guard?

Geographers may not mention the fact, but among the most important products of our country and among our staple importations are lawless heroes and wayward heroines. They ramp through our current novels and over our subsidized stage "living their own lives." (We can be grateful, by the way, that they're not living ours.) Through the medium of special newspaper writers with alliterative names they tell the credulous public that their particular murder or adultery or robbery was the expression of their eager, panting souls. They did no wrong; how could they, when they were following their esthetic conscience? What we call crime, they call necessary self-expression. Men, stand to the life-buoy!

Irritating and ridiculous as these criminals in evening clothes may be, they are after all only the camp followers of a very definite school of morality. They all stand valiantly for the principle that whatever the individual decrees to do is right; evil is whatever the individual conscience feels itself unable to perform. Morality for them is so much a matter of private interpretation that any crime from manslaughter to the wholesale production of literature reeking of vice is justified by the smug criminals and hysterical feminists who hold office in the "Eager Society of Sob Sisters." We must not be too hard on them for carrying to its ridiculous conclusion the theory of subjective morality.

Since the days of Kant, its ablest exponent, the subjective school of morality has flourished mightily. Kant held that a morally good action is one which my reason decrees and which I feel could be made the universal rule of action for all men. Shall I die for my country? asks the soldier as his officer calls for volunteers in an enter-

prise that means certain destruction. Yes, he answers; because my reason bids me die for my land, and because the best rule for all men under these circumstances would be to die thus for their land.

Shall I leave my husband? asks the modern heroine, in and out of the covers of our best-sellers, when her butterfly affection has flitted to the handsome coast guard. Yes, she cries, placing her hand where her heart, if she had one, would be located; because my reason bids me leave where love no longer dwells, and I should wish all women to do as I do under the same circumstances. An ethical society of self-respecting Eskimo squaws would sniff at such morality, while a professor without a sense of humor would begin to explain the distinction between reason and caprice. But why should the moralist who accepts as his moral standard the individual conscience condemn her? Each one in his theory is moral dictator for himself, not only judging what is right and wrong but actually making it so. As dictators are notoriously irresponsible, we need not be surprised at the sickening procession of men and women in fiction and real life for whom the whim of the minute has become the law of life. Nor need we flatter ourselves that the end is yet.

Why will people persist in talking as if our reason were really the only unreasonable thing in the world? Unlike the German philosopher in the famous yarn, we do not pull down the blinds and fling all our natural histories in the fire when we want to know what a camel may be like. We trot out to the zoo and look a camel straight in the eye. If we don't, ten to one our camel will be a hippogrif or a dodo. In the same identical way the reason does not go into a darkroom to spin unreal theories out of nebulous data. It is not reason but nonsense unless it bases its operations on the facts of life.

So once more our moralistic friends are looking through the large end of the opera glasses. An action like murder or kidnaping, is not wrong because my reason forbids it; my reason, if it makes any pretense of being reasonable, forbids it because it is wrong. My reason, as soon as it knows anything about the nature of arsenic, mildly suggests the inadvisability of consuming it with my meals. Arsenic, however, is not slightly deleterious because my reason forbids it; my reason forbids it because, as a substitute for demi-tasse, arsenic is not conducive to long life or proper digestion. Some kind grammarian ought to write a guide to the uses of "because."

Take a swift glance at any of the thousand actions which from the dawn of history, man's reason has classified as good or bad. In every case you will find that there is something in the very act itself which forces man's reason to approve or disapprove it. Every reasonable man recognizes the moral goodness of patriotism because through it our national life, so necessary to true peace and temporal prosperity, alone can be conserved. In a parallel way men recognize the evil of treason because like the ambushed assassin it aims with cowardly malice

at the peace and happiness not of a single individual but of a whole people. There is something inherent in every good action which forces the human reason to approve it; and something in every evil action which forces the reason to condemn it. And that something we claim is its conformity or lack of conformity to man's rational nature taken in all its aspects.

Perhaps this may look a bit vague and cryptic; if so, blame a new combination of words; the fact itself is familiar to every moral man and woman. You, kindly reader in your armchair, act upon it a thousand times a day. Suppose, for example, that an honorable man feels within himself the sudden wild impulse to grip the throat of the scoundrel who ruined him in business; instantly his better nature (See, how we seem to slip into the phrase?) rises in protest, and he casts the impulse aside as unworthy of him. Why? Because he sees clearly that murder reduced man to the level of a beast of prey, making him worthy fellow of the wolf and the panther; murder is against his whole rational nature. Why does a pure woman shrink so swiftly from the slightest stain upon her honor? Because she realizes that her woman's nature has entitled her to a niche just below the angels, and every impulse that tends to cloud her stainlessness causes her to be less the being whose purity makes men honorable, and more the mere animal whose passion makes men beasts. Eating and drinking in themselves are actions which we share in common with the brute, though absolutely necessary for life. But we are instantly aware that when a man eats, as the Romans did, for the sheer joy of eating, or when a man allows a craving for drink to ruin his poetic genius, he works against his human nature and commits a morally wrong act.

\* For all their arguments to the contrary, the Hedonist and the Social Utilitarian could not stay moral men for a single day unless they were constantly recurring to their human natures as the moral metric stick by which to measure their conduct. An action, say they, is morally good which promotes happiness. Yes, but surely all happiness is not moral. We have only to glance at the dens of our cities to realize that fact. Only that happiness is moral which conforms to man's rational nature,

which raises it up and ennobles it. The libertine and the drunkard have no right to call their bestial pleasures man's true happiness, because they drag man's intellect and will through the gutters and make their victims false to the duties which constitute man's highest dignity.

In this day of men whose favorite study is their image in a glass and of women whose horizon is bounded by the hem of their skirts one must keep dinnings with monotonous repetition on that tiny additional phrase, "taken in all its aspects." Is it not maddening to hear our cant writers harping on "self realization," as if men and women were isolated beings with the breeze and the sea-foam for their parents and the upper regions of the air for their habitat? There is no genuine self realization which does not take into consideration human nature in all its aspects, and very importantly in its essential relations to others.

We are bound, whether we like it or not, with woven steel to our parents, to our children, to civil society, to God. The mother who, in her enthusiastic hunt after culture, has to inquire her baby's name each time she goes to see it, may be wise as Aspasia; in one very important relation she is not a moral woman. A lie may here and now be to the eminent advantage of a lawyer; yet because of his essential duties as a member of the State, he may not perform an act that weakens the mutual trust and confidence without which society would be worse than a confederacy of picaroons. And while other moral systems, which regard man's epitaph as the end of all, may see no good in a man who contributes nothing to society's temporal prosperity, we find place in our moral world for the martyr, the missionary, the Poor Clare, and the man who lives to see noble hopes and dreams crushed into pitiful fragments.

It is the proud boast of Catholic philosophy that, here as elsewhere, she is the valiant champion of human nature. She stands for all that is best and noblest in man's nature; she points out a moral guide that cannot but lead him aright. The man and woman who keep their grip fixed on their human nature will not find themselves twisted from their path by every whim that blows hot with the breath of passion. Our moral standard is the sure cure for caprice.

## Who's Who in Quebec

J. C. WALSH

**W**HEN the officers of the French regiments in Canada went home to France after the cession of 1763, as most of them did, the population left behind consisted of some 60,000 souls. A good many of the *seigneurs* remained, and a delightful section of the native literature is that in which the life of the countryside under the old manorial conditions is described. But the bulk of the population were the tenant farmers, the

*roturiers*. I once asked a brilliant writer, with a talent worthy of Paris, if he were related to a judge of his name. "There is no *seigneur* about me," he answered. "I am a *roturier*." It was just about that time the lawyers at the bar had agreed to *Votre Seigneurie* as a free translation for "Your Lordship," by which title a Canadian judge is invoked in England. The device was accepted, but one venerable magistrate was prompted to comment that, "Of

our *seigneuries* there seems to remain only the *banalités*," that being the name given to one of the feudal privileges from which the old *seigneur* derived his profit.

Considering that this seigniorial system lasted in full vigor until the middle of the last century, and that it is still a matter of prime importance when buying land to make sure that the seigniorial dues have been commuted and paid, it is not difficult for anyone with a sense of values in sociology to realize that here is a community which has habits, manners, outlook and a history of its own, and that standards which can be freely and accurately applied elsewhere do not necessarily apply here at all. Where you can follow a family from the early part of the seventeenth century, from its little farm on the St. Lawrence or the Richelieu, back, back, back from the river front as the generations multiplied, then into the towns and at last into the cities, where you can trace words they brought with them from Normandy or from Anjou, where you can listen to the songs they brought with them three hundred years ago and which you hear nowhere else on this continent, you find yourself in presence of a soul which is entitled to respect, and which will not make itself over to the pattern you in your wisdom prescribe, even if you issue your commands roughly.

The type of Quebec farm, everywhere, until a few years ago and in many sections yet, was the "full" farm, laid out and worked to give a complete existence to the family just as if the rest of the world did not exist. There were fields for bread, and fields for meat; there was the carefully tended wood-lot; the women wove the cloth from the wool of their own sheep and from the cloth they made the clothes. Economically, that was the solid foundation of life. Socially, there was a system deeply rooted in religion and kindness. The parish church was the center of all communal activities. A society whose growth has been as that of the Scriptural mustard-tree is not to be refashioned as a tailor makes over an old coat. Unfortunately that is an idea many well-meaning people, and many others, never can get into their heads.

One could deduce, if he did not know, the professional element in such a community. The priest, the doctor, the notary; at a long distance from the beginnings of development, the lawyer. Indeed the lawyer came with the town, and he got his training, like the others of the élite, mainly in the classical colleges which rose upon the devotion of Religious Orders. Not until the third quarter of the nineteenth century, but since then with a vigor that has brought remarkable results, were the people able to engage seriously in commerce, industry, finance and the professions related to natural science. Political leaders they had always had, men of power and of achievement. And there was always a high order of journalism, even if it was compassed about by much not so high.

This old Quebec, which is keenly alive and sensitively responsive from brain-center to farthest extremity, finds its political expression today mainly through the voices of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir Lomer Gouin and M. Henri

Bourassa. Laurier is the leader of almost the whole of the Province's delegation in the Canadian Parliament; Gouin is the leader of an almost equally solid delegation in the legislature of the Province; and Bourassa, as popular tribune and serious journalist, yields an enormous influence in the formation of public opinion.

Laurier, of course, long ago attained to a high place in international statesmanship. It would not be appropriate to seek now to limit his standing to the rank of a Quebec politician. But what is true is that for the forty years he has been in public life his own people have idolized him and have stuck to him. He has never spent a great deal of time in laboring to secure a continuance of his people's favor, and they have never required him to put on the candidate's white robe and come and beg their good-will. A strong case might even be made out for the theory that the more distinction he won away from home the more his own were proud of him and content to support him. The same thing would happen tomorrow if a turn of events should cause Quebec to be forgotten and therefore to lose the self-consciousness which the none too polite attentions of others force upon her now.

Sir Lomer Gouin, on the other hand, has fought all his fights at home, and, as the Serbs and the Bulgarians say, there is no blow so cruel as that a brother strikes. Nevertheless, in the close in-fighting of now nearly a score of years, Gouin has been consistently successful, and that of itself would argue the possession of high qualities. He is endowed, in fact, with those attributes one associates with the idea of a great judge. His mind is clear as a straight road ahead, and his thought never gets lost in wayside thickets. He is a scholar, a student, a speaker whose every sentence registers a decision. He is not without warmth of imagination, but when he gives it play it is upon a concrete program, of which he transmits rather the details than the inspiration. He is endowed with that high order of prudence, or perhaps he has cultivated it, which enables a man to keep his judgment and his will traveling comfortably together in double harness. He prefers a result achieved to a project conceived, and yet he has part of the devotion of a disciple back of his determination to complete the program outlined decades ago by his predecessor and relative, Mercier. Not a seeker of quarrels, he has repeatedly carried himself with high political courage. Never a captious critic of what public men do or say in the English Provinces, he is firm in the assertion of the rights of his own Province when attacked, and he knows so well what those rights are that I can remember no occasion on which his defense was unsuccessful. No doubt he has his limitations, but if he has they are not of the sort which count in a crisis like the present, if crisis there be, when the adequate safeguard of his people's interest is the task that confronts him.

M. Bourassa, the third of the group, differs from the other two mainly in that he has deliberately put away what most public men ardently covet. He prefers the free advocacy of opinion without the hampering obliga-

tions of public office. He labors incessantly, passionately, to form the mind of his people, content that others should have what satisfaction legitimately attaches to the exercise of power associated with the translation of the popular will into legislative or executive action. Not that he shirks the awkward or the vital issues. On the contrary, he is a popular tribune in the sense that Wendell Phillips was a popular tribune, or John Bright, or Mazzini. Few men anywhere have such moving power over an audience. His labors of preparation are Gladstonian in volume and thoroughness. He has a courage and an aggressiveness that are a legacy from Papineau his great ancestor. Moreover, he writes as well as he talks, and in the one medium or in the other he can inflame or he can restrain with equal success. If he is sometimes violent, he can be contrite, and if by violence he makes enemies there is a consistency of purpose running through his career of intense and unceasing activity which has won for him the respect that is the tribute exacted from his fellows by a man of character. He fights, as Browning says, "breast forward." And, without office, he wields a power with which men in office have to reckon.

With three such men in her service, Quebec can hope to withstand what shocks the near future may have in store for her. Indeed, there are not many little peoples, if one looks the world over, who are anything like so well provided with leadership. And as all they want is to live their lives in their own way, to continue the civilization patiently builded by so many God-fearing law-abiding generations on the only soil they knew, the prospect is not nearly so bad as many excitable and doubtless well-meaning people would have us think.

## The Troubles of an Anglican Bishopric

A. HILLIARD ATTERIDGE

THE last Catholic Bishop of Hereford, Thomas Reynolds, died a prisoner for the Faith, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. He was the last of a line of prelates extending back to the days of the Mercian kingdom in the seventh century. One of the Norman Bishops, Losinga, the friend of St. Wulstan, laid the foundation stone of its cathedral, whose great central tower was erected in the days immediately before the Reformation. It has been in Protestant hands for more than three centuries. It has been disfigured by the wretched restoration work of ignorant eighteenth-century architects. The shrine of St. Ethelbert has been swept away, and the Lady Chapel, as usual in the old English cathedrals, turned into a place for the erection of monuments to men of local fame. And the Anglican clergymen who have usurped the see of Losinga, of St. Thomas of Hereford and of the confessor, Reynolds, have in later years numbered in their line of succession bishops who have held and preached doctrines that are not merely un-Catholic but can only be described as un-Christian.

In the days of the Tractarian movement, when the Church of England was staggering under the shock of Newman's conversion and the abandonment of Anglicanism by a host of its most brilliant supporters, there was a new crisis provoked by Lord John Russell's appointment of Dr. Hampden to the see of Hereford. Hampden in his Bampton lectures, and in a pamphlet written in defense of them, had questioned the full revelation of

the Scriptures and taught doctrine that was near akin to Unitarianism. Half the Bishops of the day addressed a protest to the Prime Minister; Manning, then Archdeacon of Chichester, was the chief speaker at a great indignation meeting of the clergy in London; but the protest had no effect, Hampden entered into possession of his see, a few Anglicans took the logical course of leaving a Church that had ceased to defend the elementary doctrines of Christianity, but most of them made up their minds to bear with this "new trial" of the introduction of a semi-Unitarian prelate into the episcopal bench.

Dr. Percival, who has been Bishop of Hereford since 1895, resigned his see this summer on account of age and ill health. His peculiar views had always been another "trial" to the advanced Anglicans who flatter themselves that they represent the Catholic Church of old England. Percival, a Liberal in politics and theology, held the old Protestant views that the High Churchmen repudiate, and he frankly protested against their theories. In an ordination sermon in Hereford Cathedral at the Christmas of 1908, he told the candidates for orders that the "Kingdom of Christ had no sacerdotal system," and went on to say:

This absence of any sacerdotal order from the Christian Church, rightly understood, is deserving of all the more careful attention because of the tendency of a section in our Church of England to drift back towards the erroneous and misleading Roman doctrine of a sacrificing priesthood.

The High Church party deplored Dr. Percival's views, but consoled themselves with the hope that sooner or later he would be succeeded by a more "Catholic" prelate. They have been most bitterly disappointed. Mr. Lloyd George has promoted to the see of Hereford Dr. Hensley Henson, Dean of Durham, and the promotion is a curious index of the condition of the Church of England.

Dr. Henson is an Oxford man, in his fifty-fifth year. He is described as "a Broad Churchman of independent views to which he is not afraid to give the frankest expression." So one of his admirers writes about him. His clerical career began in the London district. In 1900 he was given a canonry at Westminster Abbey and the rectorship of the parish church of St. Margaret's attached to the Abbey. Here it was that in his sermon on the Christmas morning of 1911 he told his fashionable congregation that the story of the Nativity in St. Luke was probably nothing more than a beautiful poetical legend. There were of course some protests in the Anglican press, but Dr. Henson accentuated his strange attitude in the following Lent by inviting an Oxford Professor who had written a book on "Christianity Without Miracles" to deliver a course of lectures at St. Margaret's, Westminster, on the same theme—the miracles eliminated being amongst others the Virgin Birth of Christ and the Resurrection, as usually understood by Christians.

Instead of incurring any official censure Dr. Henson received promotion. In the same year (1912) Mr. Asquith, then Prime Minister, appointed him Dean of Durham, where there is a minor university for the training of candidates for the Anglican ministry. While Dean of Durham Dr. Henson has more than once addressed Nonconformist bodies, on two of these occasions in defiance of protests from bishops who are now to be his colleagues on the episcopal bench. He has taken a frequent part in newspaper controversies. He opposes disestablishment, and holds that the "National Church" should have room for men of a great variety of opinions. He has written that of course a clergyman must accept the Apostles' Creed, but he adds that there must be a wide freedom as to the interpretation of it. Judging from his Westminster sermon he himself interprets it in a sense that is neither Catholic nor Christian.

Already there are protests against his appointment to the see of Hereford. A meeting of clergymen at Oxford has called upon the Dean and Chapter to refuse to accept him as their

bishop. It is quite certain that they will obey the law and make the best they can of the new appointment. The protests will be as futile as those that were made against Dr. Henson's predecessor, Bishop Hampden, in 1848. It is unhappily true that numbers of both clergy and laity in the Church of England no longer have any real belief in the Divinity of Christ. Dr. Henson represents a large party. His promotion is a new illustration of the "comprehensiveness" of the Church of England. Even the episcopal bench itself represents every variety of belief. Probably some few Anglicans may be forced by this new manifestation of the nature of the Church of England to realize that such a Babel cannot be the Church of Christ which guided by the Holy Spirit is to teach God's truth to the end of time. Others will go on lamenting the "trials" of the Church, and protesting that her real mind is "Catholic," despite the imposition of an unorthodox prelate on what the *Church Times* describes as "the unfortunate see of Hereford."

### COMMUNICATIONS

*Letters, as a rule, should not exceed six hundred words.*

#### Clerical and Lay Activity

*To the Editor of AMERICA:*

Letters on the question of the cooperation of the Catholic clergy or lack of it, in movements to suppress "white slavery," interest me principally for the light they throw on our attitude toward public movements, which immediately or remotely concern faith and morals. The normal and proper conservatism of our holy mother, the Church, places her children at a sore disadvantage in our nation, where events no longer march but roll on the rubber-tired wheels of material progress with breathless and unseemly rapidity. Fifty years ago the population of New York State was ten parts urban to ninety parts rural. Today the proportions are completely reversed, being ninety parts urban to ten parts rural. The new, or rather the added moral and economic problems presented by this fundamental and sudden change in human habits is simply staggering.

Now what I gather from the letters before-mentioned is that some writers maintain that the clergy should take more active part in public matters affecting morals. Others rather inaptly, it seems to me, fling back the taunt of disloyalty to the Church. The work of Catholic benevolent institutions in this country in the face of difficulties is marvelous. The work, such as it is, of the clergy is to the glory of God and the credit of the clergy. But how about the laity? There's the rub. The laity should, and undoubtedly could, do more. But the laity does not do what it could do. Why? Because the clergy or officers of the Church militant do not utilize to best advantage the ready services of the soldier laity. The clergy is concerned with purely parochial matters, too much to the exclusion of everything else. There should be in every parish, worthy of the name, boards of laymen concerned with the following matters:

(1) Parochial and diocesan finances as they affect the civic community; for example, the financing of far-reaching benevolent movements like the Knights of Columbus' fund for the soldiers, the promotion of a healthy organization for boys after the pattern of the Boy Scouts, or collecting campaigns for eleemosynary institutions.

(2) The vigorous combating of anti-Catholic associations, when they venture to take sides in politics for the avowed purpose of injuring the Church.

(3) The establishment of more St. Vincent de Paul Conferences and their reasonable cooperation with civic, organized non-Catholic or non-sectarian charities. In most cities the Jewish charities have a standing order with the main organized charity associations to turn over to them all Jewish destitutes. There is no such thing in most Catholic dioceses. Here and there an en-

terprising clergyman will act on his own account for his own parish. Many Catholic clergymen refuse to listen to any but direct appeals, and all cooperation with any society not frankly Catholic. I will venture to say that only good could come of it, if in every non-sectarian charity organization there was a recognized representative of the Bishop, preferably a member of the society of St. Vincent de Paul.

(4) Constant watchfulness to check, as far as possible, the spreading of pornographic literature, pictures and entertainments. The enforcement of decency in pleasure resorts and the general enforcement of the law in regard to public morals.

A diocesan group of aggressive and influential laymen could do vastly more practical good in having certain temptations done away with than a year of Sunday sermons. It would make an interesting point of dispute whether he is the more practical Christian, who stands in the pulpit and warns the susceptible in his congregation to look the other way on passing a flagrantly indecent poster, or he who goes down and persuades the chief of police to have it removed. Now I maintain that it is the place of the priest to seek out, each in his own parish, members who will act on such boards and encourage them in their efforts. The recent article of Father Garesché in AMERICA, begging Catholics to take more interest in the proper conduct of public schools, is a matter in point. What is everyone's business is no one's. If the Bishops asked every priest to appoint in his parish one man to do this in cooperation with the rest how much might be done? As the article stands, Tom, Dick and Harry reads and then runs to the next article, sighing: "What can I do alone?"

The average parish priest, although there are brilliant exceptions, considers that his duties begin and end with the Sacraments, the collections and the school. The wealth of possibilities in parochial organization is left entirely to the voluntary and oftentimes indifferently accepted efforts of laymen. The success or failure of the parish as a civic institution depends too much on the initiative of the parish priest.

There should be a high and generally accepted standard of what constitutes a well-organized parish over and above the number of communicants, and the size of the Sunday collection and the school, and, it might be added, the outward splendor of the church edifice.

These suggestions call for very little more work from the already overburdened parish priest, but offer means of utilizing a great quantity of parochial ability and good-will that lie fallow solely for want of planting the seed. The greater utilization of sodalities, where these exist, and the founding of them where they do not, offer the most obvious field for cultivation. These things can always be done without "band-wagon" or "Billy Sunday" methods. Furthermore, I submit that to hold that we may not cooperate with non-Catholic citizens toward the common good in matters of morals for fear of scandal is rank bigotry and not holiness.

Buffalo.

J. S. L.

#### Some Irish Old and New

*To the Editor of AMERICA:*

As a reader of your valuable weekly, though not an old Holy Cross College boy of '61, may I be permitted to say a word on the subject of "Some Irish Old and New," which is at present eliciting some friendly criticism in your pages. Mr. Philip J. Libby has my sincere sympathy in having to listen to those "vulgar slurs" and ignorant sneers hurled at him by the "ould country Irish," as "country born," "second crop" and "Yankee born."

But if this Mr. Libby listened at a little closer range he would hear from another camp more insidious epithets hurled into other ears such as "greenhorns," "salt-water boys" and "micks." Both attacks are to be deplored and are due to ignor-

ance; but which is the more to be condemned? I think that the sons of the "old stock" are more insulting to the offspring of this old stock when they designate them as salt-water boys, micks, and the like. It is unworthy of the best traditions of our race and betrays a narrow-mindedness unworthy of dear old "Banba of the Streams." But we must always consider the sources of such gross insults, and I believe the Irish-American who criticizes the "old country borns" is himself unworthy of the traditions of Irish ideals. Probably he is the son of some "get-rich-quick," whose parents were never anything in Ireland, and now that they have made a little money in this country, wish to be known as the Shoneens who hate Ireland as much as the genuine Celt "loves" England.

Genoa, Ill.

T. O'BRIEN.

#### The St. Vincent de Paul Society

To the Editor of AMERICA:

An ever-timely topic for discussion is the work of the St. Vincent de Paul Society. The value of this labor of love cannot be estimated in dollars and cents nor properly appreciated by a study of statistics; nevertheless every effort should be made to increase the efficiency of the society. We may moralize as much as we please on the good that is done but wherever there is room for improvement in method or in practice no means which has justified its value by actual experiment should be ignored. Criticize as you may organized charity, these organizations have spent thousands of dollars in perfecting methods of relief and investigation. Their main defect from a Vincentian standpoint is that they are "heartless." Why not adopt what is good in them and send some purifying Vincentian blood through the system to spiritualize, and if necessary, humanize it? We should not be either afraid or ashamed to learn "from the enemy."

In the discussion of the society there has been stated but little that has a constructive character. We would welcome a statement of the ways and means of perfecting our social-service work by anyone experienced in this field, and many Conferences would adopt such of the suggestions as would increase the efficiency of their available resources. This, however, depends upon the director of the individual Conference. Here, as in all other matters of a diocesan character, we are handicapped by parochialism. The spiritual director's vision may be horzoned by the parish limits, while the methods of the Conference including suggestions for improvements may be confined to the same territorial restrictions; others, however, are of a more progressive character to whom suggestions are not intrusive.

New York.

R. S.

#### The Bishop of Ukraine

To the Editor of AMERICA:

AMERICA, in its issue of December 29, referred to the consecration of Mgr. Theodoroff by the Most Rev. Metropolitan of the Uniates, Count Andrew Szeptycki. As a personal friend of the Rt. Rev. Leonidas Theodoroff, or in Russian, Fiodoroff, I am able to give to the readers of AMERICA a few details concerning the new Bishop of Ukraine. The Bishop is a convert from the Russian schism. He joined the Catholic Church in 1906, when Archbishop Szeptycki, after long negotiations between the Apostolic See and the Russian Government, went to Russia in order to investigate the validity of the ordinations of the schismatic sect of the Staroviercy, or Old Faith, which is the least opposed to the Catholic Church. Many converts from this sect have joined the Catholic Church, thanks to the grace of God and the endeavors of Archbishop Szeptycki and the late Bishop Ortynski. Archbishop Szeptycki traveled throughout Russia and brought back into the Church a very great number of persons belonging to the highest Russian aristocracy.

Among the converts in Petrograd was the sister of the former Russian War Minister, Sazonoff, who is a near relative of Bishop Fiodoroff. Miss Sazonoff built, at her own expense on St. Basil's Island, in Petrograd, a Catholic church for the Slavonian rite, of which the Rev. Alexander Ivanovich Dayjbner was appointed pastor. In 1913 this zealous priest was arrested and exiled by the Russian Government, but he has returned to his flock.

Bishop Fiodoroff was born in 1880 and was twenty-six years old when Archbishop Szeptycki met him. As the young man was himself a member of an old aristocratic family, he was interested in the new conversions and soon fell under the influence of Archbishop Szeptycki. Fiodoroff joined the Church in 1906. He finished his theological studies in 1909, in Rome, in the Gregorian and there we became friends. Having been ordained, he entered, in 1910, the old Greek Order of the Studites, which was founded in the fifth century in Constantinople. This Order resembles the Trappists in the severity of its observance.

At present Bishop Fiodoroff is thirty-eight years old and is a man of great talents and holiness of life. He possesses profound historical knowledge, and notwithstanding his comparative youth, a wide experience. In his external appearance he is a striking contrast to the Bishop who ordained him. Archbishop Szeptycki is a giant, over seven feet tall; the new bishop of Ukraine resembles a young Sicilian altar boy, with delicate figure, dark hair and angel-like features.

We should like to ask the prayers of the readers of AMERICA for the new Bishop and his work, as there are well-founded hopes now that Ukraine is independent, of bringing back to the unity, of the Catholic Church some 30,000,000 of these Ukrainians who are now living in schism.

Frankford, Pa.

VЛАДИМИР ПЕТРИВСКИЙ.

#### Cardinal Newman's Correspondence

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Having gone over carefully and interestingly the two volumes with the title, "The Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman," edited by Cardinal Newman's sister, after his decease, and at his expressed wish, I have been surprised not to find in all the long correspondence presented, a single letter from any one of three prominent Tractarians, who left an indelible impress on the Oxford Movement, namely, Ward, Faber and Hope Scott. Of the three, Ward took a foremost part.

Surely, with the divergence of views held by Newman and Ward, as to the presentation of principles enunciated in the "Tracts," many letters must have passed between them. Those differences in treating of the subjects are set forth in Wilfrid Ward's life of Cardinal Newman. The first mention of Ward, Faber and Hope Scott occurs in the correspondence of 1838-1839. Can any light be thrown on the non-appearance of letters written before that date to these gentlemen? Is it possible that no such letters were written or preserved?

Oakland, Calif.

THOMAS F. MARSHALL.

#### Caring for the Child

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The article on Sociology, entitled "Caring for the Child," published in the issue for October 13, 1917, has suggested the enclosed draft on New York for \$25.00. Please transmit it to the persons in charge of the institution which cares for "the babies that no one wants."

Kuala Lumpur, Selangor, F. M. S. P. J. FITZGERALD.

[This contribution from the other side of the world has been forwarded to the great institution conducted by the Sisters of Charity, the New York Foundling Hospital.—Ed. AMERICA.]

# AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1918

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.

President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSLER; Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BRENN.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00
Canada, \$3.50
Europe, \$4.00

Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.  
CABLE ADDRESS: CATREVIEW.

*Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.*

### Stand By the President

AMERICANS, as a people, know very little about war. In the sense that war never loomed large in their thoughts as a means to national honor and prosperity, they have not been rated a war-like people. These ends they have preferred to attain by pacific means. Thus a generation has come to maturity, to whom war has seemed something exotic, to be looked for in other countries, but foreign to the busy, peaceful United States. Hence it is not altogether strange that there are some in our midst, not many, but too many, who appear to believe that a declaration of war is equivalent to a successful conclusion of the war; or that certain volatile and picturesque Americans, not hitherto rated with Washington or Lee as statesmen and military geniuses, profess to see the ship of State heading directly for the rocks, under the unskilful pilotage of President Wilson.

Much of this criticism would be amusing, were it not for the fact that some citizens take it seriously. It might be alleged with partial truth, that the country has prepared for war with a slowness which is causing some uneasiness among the Allies, but to say that we are on the rocks, or even in the neighborhood of rocks, is to go beyond the facts. War is not so calm an occupation as knitting, and is acknowledged to be more perilous than sheep-herding; it has, moreover, asked much from thousands of American fathers and mothers, and before the blessed dawn of peace may call upon every American to pay for the privileges of freedom in the coin of sacrifice. These are things which only now we are beginning to realize. The realization inclines us to be captious, perhaps unfair, and, as was to be expected, the War Department has borne the brunt of the attack. That Department, as the Secretary freely confesses, has made its

mistakes; but such accusations as that through stupid neglect, our soldiers in the cantonments are dying "like East Side babies in summer," is both unjust to the Department and thoughtlessly cruel to the families of the enlisted men. The fact is that the death-rate from September, 1917, to January 1, 1918, was somewhat lower than that of civilians of the same age. Nor has the Secretary's contention that "no army of a similar size has ever been raised, trained and equipped so quickly," been successfully controverted. No one will contend, least of all the Secretary, that, in any department, the army has reached its highest point of development; nevertheless, what has already been done is a fair guarantee for the future.

Finally, there seems little reason to believe that the President is seeking to make himself a dictator. It is, of course, possible to conceive a worse creation than a dictator; a bungling board, for instance, composed of "pork-barrel politicians," in charge of a war for the preservation of democracy. But as conditions now are and are likely to remain, boards and dictators are equally remote. No one acquainted with the tremendous powers vested, directly and by implication, in the President by the Constitution, will be tempted to say that Mr. Wilson has in any way trespassed upon functions beyond the scope of his high office. That is an accusation to be urged only by prejudice or ignorance. In a republic such as ours, there is always place for criticism, incisive criticism, destructive criticism in certain crises, and criticism of every kind, except dishonest, malevolent criticism. It is only reasonable to assume that Congress and the courts may be relied on to preserve unimpaired the system of checks and balances, characteristic of the American form of government, leaving to the citizen the duty and privilege of omitting nothing which may strengthen the hands of our civil superiors. Criticism is useful, but obedience comes first, and the first and plain duty of every American citizen is to stand by the President.

### Catholic Mothers and the Vote

NOW that the women have the vote, New York expects every woman to do her duty, and use with discernment the privilege which has been conferred upon her. In the metropolis, she will not lack teachers, for many have undertaken the task, if task it be, of enlightening her intellect on affairs of public moment, and of awakening her will to cast her vote in such wise, that the civic millennium may be looked for within a reasonable time after the next election. Democrats and Socialists, Laborites and Republicans, political parties of varied names and purposes, and even church societies, have established schools or bureaus for the express purpose of teaching the new voters how to exercise the franchise for the greatest common weal. In avowed design, at least, all these movements are praiseworthy. In practice, however, much of the energy which they are gener-

ating may be lost. For if the common tradition of mankind is not to be overturned, the women will, in the end, make up their minds for themselves, with little reference to outside influences, and either not vote at all, or vote as "they feel like."

It is probably true that very many Catholic women, perhaps the majority, look upon the vote with indifference, if not with a certain unfounded dislike. This is a condition which should not be allowed to continue, for never was it more important that the franchise be used, and used properly. In these days, when the wildest theories, resting upon principles destructive of good order in the community, may be given practical expression through ill-considered social legislation, to vote is rather a duty than a privilege. Nothing can ever take the place, in Catholic hearts, of the "old-fashioned mother" whose first duty and highest happiness was to care for those of her household. Under changed circumstances, however, it may become the duty of the "old-fashioned mother," who is really not "old-fashioned," but the perennial product of Catholic principles, to use her influence for the protection of the community, as well as for the good of her own home.

#### An Irresistible Appeal

THOUGH AMERICA, as is well known, has always sternly refused to open its editorial columns to appeals for the needy, the time seems to have at last come for making an exception to this iron rule. For even editors have hearts, and, when a strikingly worthy charity is brought to their attention, the most hardened and cynical of their tribe, sometimes rise above themselves and plead so eloquently for the cause that the relief-fund soon runs up to the millions. That being so, the moving nature of the following appeal, our readers will no doubt agree, leaves the editor quite unable to avoid publishing it:

##### *Friends:*

Please take enclosed tickets, and more if you can, . . . to help feed the dogs and cats sent to the Animal Refuge, 810 Ensor Street. Only tickets bought from us do we get a percentage on. The cost of food, even for animals, has increased greatly, and the ones at the Refuge who [sic] are there until good homes are found, must be fed. This year we are doing even more charity work by having to accept pets sent us by people who can no longer feed them. Think how the separation of poor people from their pets is alleviated by sending them to the Refuge, where they will be cared for, instead of having to have them condemned to death. Remember what dogs are doing for us at the "Front"—doing scout work and relief work such as even man cannot do. Europe has honored these dogs with medals of recognition for bravery. Do we not owe the homeless ones in our own city food and shelter? They all have the capacity for faithfulness, bravery and patience, even if they have not been called out to serve the colors. Help us as you always do, and accept our grateful appreciation.

MRS. BOLLING BARTON,  
*President pro tem.*

It is hard to see how any heart but one of adamant can resist this appeal. Though the papers are filled with urgent pleas to help starving Italy, famishing Armenia and war-worn Poland; though hungry England is clamoring for 75,000,000 bushels of American wheat; though there are numberless poor in our own cities and towns who are actually without the necessities of life; nevertheless, the far more pressing needs of the cats and dogs who [sic] have found a home in Mrs. Bolling Barton's Animal Refuge should open wide both our purses and our hearts. True, milk is so high that Mrs. Murphy's youngest child will hardly survive the winter, yet think what a comfort it will be to Miss Perkins who has been tearfully separated from her darling Pussy, to know that owing to your timely contribution the little quadruped orphan will still enjoy its accustomed morning cream at the Animal Refuge on Ensor Street. And though everybody knows that because coal cannot be had, the entire Rospilloosi family is down with pneumonia, two of them so ill that they will probably die, think how much your generous contribution to Mrs. Barton's fund will do to keep cozy and warm that high-bred Pekinese whom the childless Mrs. Uplift has sorrowfully sent to the Animal Refuge. Finally, because there are some men heartless enough to hold that institutions like that at 810 Ensor Street, Baltimore, should be investigated by our food and fuel administrators, and obstinate enough to maintain that the funds already collected by the President of the Animal Refuge, its six vice-presidents and its large board of managers, could best be used to buy a quantity of chloroform for the promotion of euthanasia among the furry inmates of the Refuge, remember that these unfeeling persons' very attitude of mind makes it all the more incumbent on our readers to see that the unappreciated American relatives of those noble dogs at the front who [sic] have been decorated for courage and efficiency should receive some substantial marks of recognition, at least for their admirable "capacity for faithfulness, bravery and courage."

#### Catholic Unity League

THE recent Luther celebrations have revealed to us the woful misconception regarding all things Catholic which still exists in the Protestant mind, and everywhere indeed outside the Catholic Church. It was hardly possible to open even a secular magazine, treating of this subject, without seeing at first glance false, if not positively ridiculous, statements concerning Catholic doctrine and Catholic practices. There is, doubtless, in our day a better understanding between Protestants and Catholics than existed at the time when Newman wrote his "Present Position of Catholics in England." But the false views regarding the Church which are still current everywhere prevent many from seeing the truth and joyfully embracing it. A mist is hanging before their eyes,

hiding from their sight the beauty of the one true Spouse of Christ. For many, to know her would be to contribute to the utmost of their power toward giving this knowledge to the world. It is the great return they can make to Almighty God for the unspeakable grace of the true light of faith bounteously bestowed upon them.

One of the means by which the Catholic laity can assist in spreading the Kingdom of God is by the promotion of lecture courses to non-Catholics. Such a course is at present announced to be given under the auspices of the Knights of Columbus from February 10 to 24 at the Paulist Church in New York. It is the fourth annual event of this kind conducted by the Paulist Fathers, and we are told that previous courses have brought scores of converts into the Church. Doubtless the present series of doctrinal lectures will be no less rich with the blessings of God to many a non-Catholic.

But while this work is excellent, its promoters know that their individual powers are of necessity very limited. Their voice cannot reach beyond the walls of the church. Yet vast multitudes without are no less in need of Catholic instruction. Hence the reason why the indefatigable Father Conway, C.S.P., founded the Catholic Unity League (415 W. 59th St., N. Y.). Its purpose is to interest the Catholic laity in this same work of extending the Kingdom of God upon earth. Catholic men and women are invited to enlist in the association as active members or contributing members, as associate members or life members that they may thus give of their energy, or at least of their means to this noblest of all causes, the conversion of souls to Christ. The aims of the proposed enrolment of thousands of Catholic men and women in this work of the lay apostolate are thus briefly summarized by the League: "To explain Catholic truth and to answer kindly and intelligently the difficulties of earnest-minded inquirers; to further lecture courses to non-Catholics and to provide funds for their support; to distribute Catholic books and pamphlets gratis to all seekers after truth."

This is a splendid program which should meet with an enthusiastic response from the Catholic laity. The time is ripe for such instruction. Countless thousands are in search of the truth and it is our duty to point it out to them. The grace of God and their own good will, together with our earnest prayers, will accomplish the rest.

#### "The Religion of Sanity"

**S**PEAKING of an article entitled "The Religion of Sanity" which appears in its current issue, the *Century* declares that this "absorbing interpretation of the practical side of American religion should win considerable attention." To atheists, free-thinkers, and rationalists it will no doubt commend itself, but to those whose vision is not hopelessly narrow and who have retained a vestige of faith it will seem to be only another illogical generalization spun by a Socialist out of his own heart. The study, however, has an interest for those Catholics

who are bent on sending their sons to non-Catholic universities.

The writer sets forth what he believes he has found to be the religion of a Middle Western university, and doubtless his facts are correct. His conclusion, as applied to the American people, is a gross calumny, but it portrays fairly well the radical views on religion which obtain in many secular educational circles. His description of the American religion obtaining in one such circle is very frank.

This new religion of America is a thing indigenous to American soil, evolved by the people in harmony with their lives and ambitions; it has a supreme contempt for the philosophical abstractions underlying good and evil; it is a creed irreconcilable with the ideals of Christ, whom it looks on as the "apotheosis of effeminacy," "the most picturesque of failures." It is indeed called Christianity but only out of compliment to tradition, and if it uses certain Christian formulas, like "The wages of sin is death," it does so only in a new sense, namely, that sin is weakness resulting in disintegration of character; it puts cigarette-smoking on practically the same plane as promiscuous immorality, and dissuades from impurity, not because it is inherently wrong, but solely on the score that it is unmanly and acts as an obstacle to success.

Catholics who will not take the word of their ecclesiastical superiors as to the danger to faith in secular institutions of learning would do well to devote "considerable attention" to this cold, unimpassioned study of the religion taught and practised in one such institution. The description has the ring of sincerity; and although its author is a sorry philosopher and quite innocent of any knowledge of the real nature of Christianity and the ruthlessly practical side of Catholicism, he is nevertheless a keen observer of facts. He paints the Middle Western university as he saw it. Being a Socialist he will not be suspected of over-pious susceptibilities. The religion he describes is to him immensely satisfying; if he speaks of it and its adherents, the students, he does so only to praise.

Too many Catholics have come out of such universities in the same condition as his friends, aggressively Modernistic, with a crusader's passion for sweeping the musty cobwebs out of the world, taking nothing on faith, emancipated from ancient creeds, splendid pagans. Had they gone to Catholic colleges, they would have seen through the shallow superficiality of such a parody on religion, and would have aligned themselves with the vast army of profound thinkers who have tested Christianity and not found it wanting. Instead, they became intoxicated with a little learning and much sophistry, and gave up their dearest possession. Catholic parents have rued their folly in exposing immature minds to such dangers. Others who are thinking of imitating the scandalous conduct of such parents should ponder the article in the *Century*, in the light of their strict responsibility for the eternal salvation of their children.

**"The Craft of Dying"**

SINCE this devastating world-war began, a change has been noted in the average man's attitude toward death. Formerly he was loth to think of death at all, and as for speaking of it even to those seriously ill,—that was decidedly bad form. But the present conflict has made the thought of death familiar. Nearly every family in warring Europe has no doubt been bereaved of relatives, wayside crosses bearing inscriptions which commend the departed to the prayers of passersby have grown common even in Protestant England, and the importance of learning how to die well, since die we must, has been seriously brought home to many who have hitherto avoided such thoughts altogether. Very seasonable, therefore, is Longmans' recent publication of the quaint and pious fifteenth-century treatise on "The Craft of Dying," which Richard Rolle probably translated from its Latin original and which was a veritable *vade-mecum* of pre-Reformation Catholics.

So great is the Church's concern that those who are seriously ill should be prepared betimes for death that in the Middle Ages she charged "straitly every bodily leech that he give no sick man no bodily medicine unto the time that he hath warned and induced him to seek his spiritual leech." The author of "The Craft of Dying" wishes his readers to be familiar with every aid for making a good end, so he gives divers godly counsels regarding the temptations that beset the dying, suggests what questions should be put to them, tells what dispositions they should be in, and what "obsecrations" they ought to use. Those who assist at death-beds are advised, for instance, to

Present to the sick the image of the crucifix; the which should evermore be about sick men, or else the image of Our Lady, or of some other saint the which he loved or worshiped in his

heal. Also let there be holy water about the sick; and spring [sprinkle] often times upon him, and the others that be about him, that fiends may be voided from him.

The high importance of the sick man's heart being "meeked to the knowledge of the defaults" which he has committed to the end that he may "duly repent them" is also emphasized. But there is nothing more beautiful in the little book than the "obsecrations" that the seriously ill are exhorted to make to "the right glorious Virgin Mary, which is the very mean [mediator] of all sinners," and who is the "most remedious speed and help of all sinful men to God." Those who assist the dying are bidden say to Our Lady for instance:

Ever clean and blessed Maiden Mary, singular help and succor in every anguish and necessity, help us sweetly and show to our brother, thy servant, thy glorious visage now in his last end. And void all his enemies from him, through the virtue of thy dear beloved Son, our Lord Jesu Christ, and of the holy Cross; and deliver him from all manner disease of body and soul, that he may thank and worship God withouten end. Amen,

O glorious Queen of Heaven, mother of mercy, and refuge of all sinful men; reconcile me to thy sweet Son, my Lord Jesu, and pray for me, sinful wretch, to His great mercy, that for love of thee, sweet Lady, He will forgive me my sins.

O right entire and eternal Blessed Lady, glorious maid, aideress and helper of all anguish and necessity, succor us sweetly now; and show to thy servant here, N., our brother, thy gracious visage in this last necessity. Withdraw and put from him all his enemies, by the virtue of thy right dear Son, Our Lord Jesu Christ, and by His holy Cross and Passion; and deliver him from all anguish of body and soul, to the end that to God our Lord he yield praising without end.

Thus did the Catholics of medieval times learn the "craft for to die for the health of man's soul," and out of a desire to make "a clean end" they had recourse, as do their children in the Faith today, to Blessed Mary, the Refuge of Sinners.

## Literature

**THE GENIUS OF COOPER**

AMONG noteworthy contributions to the story of American letters I have enjoyed most, William Crary Brownell's essay on Cooper. And particularly, because in writing it Mr. Brownell definitely restored to his properly high niche in our literary hall of fame one of the world's greatest romancers; it is not too much to say that he rehabilitated Cooper.

The treatment accorded by American critics to one whom Mr. Brownell ranks "with all but the greatest" of our literary possessions, signalizes the perils that exist for the Catholic student in drifting with prevailing currents in literary criticism. Among the few possessions of inestimable value to such a student is his detachment; and he most of all, should be chary of accepting the mere judgment of the day as it may run. Where in the critic perception is lacking, it would obviously be too much to expect appreciation. And the treatment of Cooper at the hands of imperfectly equipped censors suggests that the walls of every study and every classroom should bear this admonition: Criticize, if you like, freely; but always remember you are, first of all, criticizing yourself.

The readers of AMERICA have particular, even painful, reason to know that most men are content to let others do their think-

ing for them. This always limits the number of thinkers to be reckoned with; and of these but a few are trustworthy. For it is not enough to think independently. As Mr. Brownell himself has somewhere expressed it: "To produce vital and useful criticism it is necessary to think, think, think, and then, when tired of thinking, to think more."

However, he has not been content to rest a defense of Cooper on the quite ample grounds of his own judgment. From the resources of an erudition, embarrassing in its amplitude, to ordinary critics, he summons, for example, two of the greatest names in all fiction to bear witness to our novelist's rank in the very important field of the portrayal of character: "I have to own," said Thackeray, "that I think the heroes of another writer, viz., Leatherstocking, Uncas, Hardheart, Tom Coffin, are quite the equal of Scott's men; perhaps Leatherstocking is better than any one of 'Scott's lot.' *La Longue Carabine* is one of the great prize men of fiction. He ranks with your Uncle Toby, Sir Roger de Coverley, Falstaff—heroic figures all—and the artist has deserved well of his country who devised them."

"I doubt," said Balzac, "whether the works of Walter Scott present us with such a splendid creation as this hero of the forest and the plains." And Balzac's biographer, M. André Breton,

adds: "I fear that the usurers of Balzac, his lawyers, bankers and notaries, owe too much to the sojourn his imagination had made in the cabin of Leatherstocking or the wigwam of Chingachgook, and that there are in the '*Comédie Humaine*' too many Mohicans in spencers or Hurons in frock coats." "Sainte-Beuve praises without reserve," continues Mr. Brownell, "that creative power of Cooper which gave birth to such original characters, a power similar to that of Rabelais when he created 'Panurge,' of Le Sage when he conceived 'Gil Blas' and Richardson 'Clarissa.'"

Yet it is precisely Cooper's "Mohicans," from whom, it would seem, even Balzac could derive inspiration, who have been called on to withstand the chief American attacks on his portrayal of character. And like most of our hardy aborigines, his Indians have stood the critical onslaught well. They were not only the first genuine Indians to make an appearance in literature but they have never successfully been discredited either as types or characters. The ridicule heaped on them is to be accounted for in great part by the fact that the "noble white man" wanted their lands. And to hang a dog, with popular approbation, English practice requires that you first give him a bad name. The viewpoint of the hardy frontiersmen, colored by outbreaks of savage resentment on the part of Indians that objected to being pillaged, gradually became the public viewpoint of them and this in turn furnished to our easy-chair literary critics their impressions of the red man. The Indian himself too long scorned the press-agent.

But Catholic students, least of all, have need to rely on popular tradition for their judgment of the American Indian. Their own missionaries are the highest possible authorities on the subject. And these have recorded in their life-blood the savagery and degradation of the Indian and his marvelous response to the elevating influences of Christianity. Not until the story of men like the Onondaga, Garagontié; of Tegakwitha, Lily of the Mohawks; of the Hurons of Lorette and of the Iroquois of Caughnawaga, can be blotted from our missionary records will Uncas or Chingachgook stand in need of defenders.

The women of Cooper, as well as his Indians, have been ridiculed. Fun has been poked at him because he termed them "females" and this, curiously, by men familiar with the changing fortunes of words. That which is now almost strictly a designation of one sex, stood in his day for "woman" and legitimately, for a young woman. The "finishing school" of Cooper's day was a "female academy." One might as well object to the "wig of Lovelace and the hoop of Clarissa." And in stories of romance and adventure, men naturally play the dominant part. Such stories, too, are usually set in times of great public stress, and in these circumstances—if latterly we except the suffragette—women do not "act up" as they do in novels of manners. But anyone that imagines Katherine Plowden or Cora Munro could not "act up" on necessary occasion, could hardly set up for a discriminating critic.

The picture Cooper painted in "The Leatherstocking Tales" has long since vanished from our American life, but it will always survive in his pages as an unequalled contribution to our literary possessions. When he turned to the sea for a story, his success was likewise extraordinary. How he surpassed Scott in this particular is marked in comparing "The Pilot" with "The Pirate." Indeed, it was because he was dissatisfied with Scott's sea story that he wrote "The Pilot" and the first five chapters of the American novel will stand with those of any story of the sea ever written. Consider the orderly unfolding of the plot, and its unflagging succession of incidents, with each springing naturally from its predecessor, and all reflecting that continued interest which we term suspense. Perhaps the supreme test of a story is that it will hold the reader to a finish. This "The Pilot" does.

Doubtless the greatest obstacle to Cooper's present-day popu-

larity is his prolixity. Mr. Brownell points out that Cooper belongs to youth but an American boy of my acquaintance now refuses to read any book that does not begin with, "Help! Help!" I fear there are many such young Americans and Cooper does not begin in this way. Novelists in his day rode in stage coaches, not motor-cars. Undoubtedly in the art of condensation, our fiction has improved. But in Scott's and Cooper's day they obviously lacked editors to cut down speeches such as survive now only in the *Congressional Record*. The American boy must do this editorial work for himself. In Scott and Cooper it is well worth doing.

And if I can have anything of value to urge here beyond recommending the student to read Mr. Brownell on Cooper, it is to plead that our teachers encourage their boys to read Cooper himself. Teach them how to skip and cut through over-long narration or dialogue, but urge them to stick to the story; it is in this they will find their reward. "The Leatherstocking Tales," for the most part, "The Spy" and "The Pilot" will hold any boy that can be held by romantic adventure.

By the happiest possible chance, Cooper was born in New Jersey and not in New England. This has meant much for American literature. He was, too, an Episcopalian, and a century ago that meant definitely more than it means now. His views of life are so sound as to be in our day refreshing. Indeed, to appreciate what we have lost out of our American life in a brief century one has need only to read Cooper: The high regard for the sanctity of the marriage tie—it is gone; the settled appeal to those verities common even to a divided Christian faith—wholly gone; the chivalry toward women, that rosy-cheeked if sometimes unruly foster-child of Christianity, quite gone. Read in Cooper's pages the moving death-scene of a Christian gentleman such as Colonel Howard—what novelist could truthfully write a like scene as typical of today? Mortally wounded among his "rebel" American kinsmen, Colonel Howard, Tory, dying at sea, begs of his distressed relatives that he may at least be buried in consecrated ground. Who, as this page is printed, among the great-grandchildren of men such as Colonel Howard, could explain, if questioned, what the words "consecrated ground" means? To have restored to us one of our few great literary possessions, is a genuinely patriotic thing and this Mr. Brownell has definitively done.

FRANK HAMILTON SPEARMAN.

## REVIEWS

**Giordano Bruno.** His Life, Thought and Martyrdom. By WILLIAM BOULTING. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. \$3.75.

Mr. W. Boultong represents a type of the "modern" mind which is about as uninteresting as it was common in the days before the war. He is obsessed with modernity. His sole criterion for the truth of Giordano Bruno's ideas is that they were so very modern that many of them can be paralleled by similar notions to be found in the writings of Bergson, Bradley and others who, like Bruno, have, in their attempt to live by philosophy, been equally hampered by an over-powerful imagination. In other words he is a Modernist whose endeavor in this work appears to be to show that Modernism is not so modern after all; which is pretty much just what Pope Pius X meant when he defined it as "*omnium hæreseon comlectum*." But, Mr. Boultong displays his great lack of depth most manifestly in that he evidently fails to realize that had Luther, Calvin, Bruno, Spinoza, Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, etc., not been quite so modern the world would have been much wiser and would have been spared this modern war; for in one way or another they all "perceived" (*sic*) as he says in praise of Bruno "that moral practice is not under unalterable laws: it is relative," and with this they laid the foundations for that philosophy of frightfulness which holds treaties to be mere "scraps of paper" and which, if

it could, would substitute might or "the will to power" for God's laws of right.

Another typical point in the work under review is the author's attitude towards the Church. His information about this nineteen-hundred-year-old institution is on an even lower level than is his knowledge of what may happen to lie on the other side of the moon; for, with very few points excepted, it is nothing but gross misinformation about a subject on which he could easily have informed himself had he wanted to. Yet this has not prevented his writing about the Church as though he knew it better than all the Apostles, Fathers, Popes and theologians in the past, or than all of the 300,000,000 Catholics alive and thinking in the world at present. As with those of his type the word "authority" seems to have taken very uncomfortable lodgment in his mind. Yet for all that his "thin habits and poor likelihoods of modern seeming do prefer against" it, the fact is that in all that they hold to be of faith Catholics believe not on the authority of the Church, as he would have it, but on the authority of God. The Church is merely the Divinely established and infallible guardian of that inestimable treasure of revealed doctrines which God Himself in His infinite goodness has imparted to man. Again, vagarious thinkers like Bruno turn out to be heretics more by reason of what they obstinately deny than of what they assert. And after all, what is the use of maintaining that four times five are twenty if you refuse to admit that two times two make four, or what earthly good could ever come of Bruno's enlarging chimerically upon the Copernican theory if it meant that he began by denying the personality of God and the Divinity of Christ? But then Mr. Boultong holds truth to be relative and will allow nothing so absolute as all this to loom up on his own mental horizon. The necessary consequence of this, however, is, that in adjudicating between Bruno and the Church he is almost as modern as Pontius Pilate. For Pilate believed truth to be relative; and he no less than our author yielded to "modern" opinion. While holding judgment, moreover, he also refused to weigh the other side of the case. But Pilate did not attempt to exonerate Barabbas and at the end, in a spirit of true religious indifference, he politely washed his hands; whereas Mr. Boultong has placed himself in the category of those of whom Carlyle wrote: "Their tolerance is but doubt and indifference," yet "touch," says he, "the thing they do believe and value, their own self-conceit: they are rattlesnakes then."

M. I. X. M.

**Selections from the Correspondence of the First Lord Acton.** Edited with an Introduction by JOHN NEVILLE FIGGIS, Litt.D., and REGINALD VERA LAURENCE, M.A. Vol. I, Correspondence with Cardinal Newman, Lady Blennerhassett, W. E. Gladstone and Others. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. \$5.00.

Lord Acton stated in a letter to the editor of the London *Times* dated November 21, 1874, that communion with the Catholic Church was "dearer to him than life"; a friend of his writing to the London *Tablet* shortly after his death in 1902 declared that he had it from Lord Acton's own lips that he had never doubted any of the Church's dogmas; Cardinal Newman writing to a critic of Lord Acton, under the date of April 13, 1875, said: "I do not think you should say what you say about Lord Acton. He has ever been a religious, well-conducted, conscientious Catholic from a boy"; and Acton himself, replying to a request from Cardinal Manning that he state whether he adhered to the doctrines defined in the Vatican Council, gave an answer, which if rather vague, was accepted as a satisfactory statement of his orthodoxy by the Archbishop of Westminster.

It seems necessary to reproduce these testimonies, in order to contradict the following assertion made by the non-Catholic editors of the present volume: "He [Acton] had no more faith in the infallibility of Councils than in that of Popes." In

view of the above testimonies, this assertion falls to the ground, since the infallibility of the decrees of Ecumenical Councils and the infallibility of the Popes are both articles of the Faith. Of many of the letters, however, contained in the volume, all Catholics will say, what Newman said of the letters to the *Times* that they heartily wish they had never been written. For undoubtedly they cast a good deal of doubt on the Cardinal's declaration that Lord Acton was always a well-conducted Catholic. No well-conducted Catholic would have taken the part Acton took in the political intrigue to defeat the definition of Papal infallibility, nor written the rabid diatribes against the Papacy in which Acton indulged.

At the time of the Vatican Council there was little to distinguish his attitude from that of Doellinger and Dupanloup, although he inclined rather to the views of the former than those of the latter. As Doellinger strove to enlist the service of the secular power of Germany and Dupanloup that of France, so Acton did his best to persuade Gladstone to throw the weight of the British Government's disapproval against the definition. Happily, however, he imitated not the former, but the latter, after the decrees were published, although, unfortunately, he did not make the same whole-hearted, generous and unequivocal submission as Dupanloup. In fact he expressed his opinion that excommunication was inevitable. Apparently it was only the tolerance of Cardinal Manning, based on a better knowledge of the man than that of many Catholics at the time, which saved him from being cut off from the Church. Acton's after-life proved the wisdom of the Cardinal, for in spite of the fact that he idolized his former teacher, Dr. Doellinger, and had taken from him his liberal trend of thought, as the years went on, he declared that he found it more difficult to understand the Professor's state of mind.

J. H. F.

**Great Wives and Mothers.** By HUGH FRANCIS BLUNT. New York: The Devin-Adair Company. \$2.00.

"Clean literature and clean womanhood are the keystones of civilization. This aphoristically defines the ideals of the Devin-Adair imprint." Such is the general program marked out for themselves by the publishers of this volume, and it needs but little acquaintance with the immoral trend of modern literature to appreciate the courage which it implies and the encouragement it deserves. Devin-Adair says in effect to the unprincipled author who would make money by trailing woman's honor in the dust that he need not bring his manuscript to them, and to the book-lover is given a promise that there shall be nothing in their publications to soil the imagination or degrade the heart.

The present volume is well characterized by its title. It sets forth the heights of heroism in the ordinary Christian life to which women have attained in the course of the centuries. One after another the great wives and mothers pass over the pages, a noble procession that thrills the reader and makes him proud of his Catholic ancestry. From land to land, from age to age, they have handed down the torch of faith and piety, and the sweet odor of their holy lives purifies the atmosphere of any home which is privileged to make their acquaintance. The book is intended principally by its author to lighten the labors of priests who are directing sodalities, but it has a place in every Catholic family. Convent-schools also would be wise to place it on their shelves. It will be an inspiration to their pupils and a stimulus to make their lives sublime. The author is doubtless well known to the readers of Catholic periodicals, as he has for many years been a contributor to their columns. The sketches of Margaret Roper, Elizabeth Seton and Pauline Craven are perhaps the best; but there are others, such as those of the wife of O'Connell and of Lady Georgina Fullerton, which are of almost equal interest. The style is simple, careful and entertaining. The book deserves a warm welcome.

J. H. F.

## BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Among the recently published booklets that the Catholic soldier-boy will doubtless be glad to get is a neat, khaki-covered Douay Version of the New Testament, "Army and Navy Edition" (Paulist Press, \$0.60). Another little book that will increase our fighting men's spirit of sacrifice is "The Mass and the Christian Life" (Paulist Press, \$0.30), which has been adapted from the French of Mgr. De Gibergues. A book which will help to perfect the soldier's knowledge of his profession is a "Small Arms Instructors' Manual" (Dutton, \$0.60), by Reginald Sayre, Stowe Phelps and Gerard Herrick. Its authors have aimed at outlining an intensive course of instruction which will prove efficient in the present crisis when the best work has to be accomplished in the briefest time. "The U. S. Army Manual of Small Arms Firing" has supplied the framework for the booklet, and in addition many suggestions have been added from modern works. As for the parents and relatives of the lads who have gone to the training camps, "Draftee No. 357" describes in eight excellent letters written to the "Dear Folks at Home" just what it means to be "In the National Army Hopper." (Lippincott, \$0.25.) He supplies in a chatty way interesting information about the new soldier's daily routine, meals, drill, organization, amusements, etc. "The Itinerary of a Soldier" (Service Pub. Co., Woonsocket, R. I., \$0.65 and \$0.75) is a wall-tablet, 14x18 inches in size, handsomely printed in red, black and gold containing well-chosen prayers and blessings from Holy Writ and from the Church's liturgy, and bearing the imprimatur of the Bishop of Providence. The tablet is meant for the home, the church or the club that has sent soldiers to the front, and is designed as "an adequate memorial that obtains for recognition," "the complement of the service flag," "an opportune appeal to allay human misgivings," and "the supreme source of heroism and fortitude."

The January *Month* is a particularly readable number. In "Peace at Home" Father Keating pleads for justice to the laboring poor. He shows that "the world is full of abuses against personality because God's interests in the human beings He has made are ignored and flouted" by the new paganism. "The immediate result of the elimination of the Creator is the degradation of the creature." John Ayscough begins a series of entertaining autobiographical papers called "Pages from the Past"; Father Martindale continues his study of "St. John of the Cross"; Father Thurston examines the vagaries of "The New Thought Entourage" and Hugh Anthony Allen writes a discerning appreciation of Thomas Augustine Daly's non-dialect poetry. Theodore Maynard contributes a poem on "Laughter," and Judith Carrington one on "Joy" which runs thus:

To find a friend in ev'ry sort of place,  
This were a grace;  
To know thy kinship with the wildling things,  
'Tis to gain wings;  
And if the echo of the surges roll  
Within thy soul,  
The color of the mountains light thine eyes  
And make thee wise,  
The lightning and the tempest sing to thee  
In harmony,  
And all things, from the daisy to the star,  
Be not afar  
But close, attuned to thy beating breast,  
Then thou art blest.  
Such are the doors Joy can unlock for thee—  
But only they who worship find the key.

A brief treatise displaying thorough acquaintance with three such subjects as religion, education and American citizenship, would be a rare production by the very terms of the contract; yet coming from the hand of a reputed educator, the attempt might at least exhibit an impartial recognition of the principal facts involved. Unfortunately, however, the reader who expects anything of the kind from Professor Peabody, of Harvard, in

his recent volume "The Religious Education of an American Citizen" (Macmillan, \$1.25), will meet with unqualified disappointment. To insist that "personal experience of God" must precede all authoritative information about its object, is to define religion in terms of a logical impossibility; but even this is more pardonable than the substitution of fiction for fact. The author's facility in this latter art is fairly illustrated by his insistence upon a "democratic religion"—whatever that may be—for "the many millions" who are genuine Americans, as contrasted with that "aristocracy in religion" which, he concedes, "may be attractive to the few who have become, through travel or training, practically Europeanized in taste." And yet a few trips to points very near at hand would have served to inform the Professor that Harvard is not America in microcosm.

The earnest patriot who wishes to make a practical use of the war-cry, "We eat what we can and can what we can't" will find aid and comfort in Ola Powell's "Successful Canning and Preserving" (Lippincott, \$2.00). It is a practical handbook for schools and the home, compiled, with the aid of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, in the interest of the movement for the conservation of foodstuffs and a more varied, and economical diet. The scientific principles and practical details are clearly stated and a wealth of illustration added. A study of the manual will convince even the most sceptic of the convenience of preserving, and thus wisely utilizing the yield from the greatly increased acreage of fruits and vegetables that present economic conditions have brought about.—H. E. Licks's "Recreations in Mathematics" (D. Van Nostrand Co., New York, \$1.25) is a neat little volume replete with interest not only for those who have studied mathematics and science but also for those who would care to know something about the history of the several scientific branches. It contains a number of rather ingenious problems, some, indeed, old, but others not to be found in the ordinary text-book. It brings out one point not often insisted on, namely, that the so-called general processes in mathematics, in algebra, for instance, sometimes lead to absurd conclusions. From this follows the necessity of reasoning with regard to every step and not merely following blindly the rules that are laid down.

Here are two admirable poems from "Gardens Overseas and Other Poems" (Lane, \$1.25), Mr. Thomas Walsh's latest volume. The first is a sonnet entitled "Sursum" and is "after the Spanish of Guillermo Valencia of Colombia," while the second poem, "Mother Most Powerful," is "after Giovanni Dominici, 1356-1420":

A pallid taper its long prayer recites:  
Before the altar where the censers spread  
Their lifting clouds, and bells toll out their dread,  
In grief's delirious sanctuary rites.  
There—like the poor Assisi—invites  
A cloistered form the peace All-Hallowed;  
Against the dismal portals of the dead,  
Resting his weary brows for heavenly flights.  
Grant me the honey-taste of the Divine;  
Grant me the ancient parchments' ruddy sign  
Of holy psalmody to read and prize!  
For I would mount the heights immortal crowned,  
Where the dark night is 'mid the glories drowned,  
And gaze on God, into His azure eyes!

That thou so often held Him in thine arms,  
So often pressed His infant lips to thine,  
And in thy bosom warded off the harms  
That came with flesh e'en to the Child Divine;  
That thou couldst clothe Him—feel Him cheek to cheek  
In dreams and waking—at thine ear hast known  
His first lisped, "Mother," watched His soft hands seek  
Thine aid—with glances cast on Thee alone;—  
That Thou couldst know such countless ecstasies  
Of love through that sweet hidden time of yore.  
And yet Thy heart held strong through all of these—  
Shows Thou wert mortal,—Mother,—yea, and more!

## EDUCATION

## The Success of Success

"**M**Y son," quoth a modern Solomon, "the will to win may be foolishness; ever to triumph a stumbling block. To excel is the prayer of the prudent, to succeed the birthright of the wise. The wise man always succeedeth albeit at times he winneth not; to win may work riches of a day, to succeed is the guerdon of ages."

The average classroom, whether of the grades, the high school or the college, embraces two kinds of workers, those who seek to win and those who wish to succeed. The young disciple may not at once grasp this distinction; to many there is no success that is not thoroughly triumphant. Not to be an out-and-out victor is flat failure. The untrained mind sees not that five talents as well as one may be misused, while two talents developed and not "hid in a napkin" will win the "well done" that spells success for the good and faithful servant. The greatest of orators was not victorious in his first appearance before the people but this, his maiden speech, was probably his greatest success, for it meant for him lifelong impetus to develop his better self. Not always those who win the contest, gain the greater profit therefrom. This may in some way account for the fact that, not infrequently, school prodigies and medal-winners are later buried in obscurity "to dumb forgetfulness a prey," while useful mediocrity comes to the forefront and succeeds. We can all succeed though "only one receiveth the prize."

## CHILDREN AND GROWNUPS

**A**LL of us should be candid enough to admit that we wish to succeed. Nor are children of a different clay. The ancient Stoic pretended to be indifferent to the outcome of his every work, but deep down in his cold-storaged heart, there was ever whispered a prayer that his very rejection of any courted success might be brought to a happy issue, for him at least. Today, unfortunately, success is become a god among us; his altar never lacks adorers; it is the only cult universally practised. But success is a blessing, one of God's choicest gifts, easy, it is true, of abuse, but none the less a gift and a blessing. As such it should be employed in every walk of life but in education it is invaluable. As a motive of action, "Nothing succeeds like success," may shock the moralist, and far be it from us to make success an end in itself and final. But in the hard struggle to attain and retain knowledge it is our best stepping-stone to higher things.

## THE PHILOSOPHERS' STONE

**T**HE making of success successful would seem the philosophers' stone. It will transmute humble efforts into golden excellence. Success pays with interest. Confidence in our ability to succeed in a given task is our best preparation for success. What is so encouraging as the realization that in these or similar circumstances I have succeeded before and hence that my chances of success now are equally strong? After the first success, solving puzzles in newspapers has a peculiar fascination for the younger members of the household; with what zest are even harder problems tackled. Add together all the effects of coaxing and scolding and moralizing, and it will be found that putting success within the grasp of the pupil brings a far greater efficiency. It is imperative that our charges be made to succeed as soon as possible. This may sound a bit platitudinous, but like so many obvious maxims, it is more easily preached than practised. How then can we put success within easy reach of our classes?

## A FIGHTING CHANCE

**T**O make success successful, there must always be a fighting chance for the pupil. This implies in the teacher a full realization of the abilities and inabilities of the pupils, with the

logical keeping within bounds of their capabilities. No rational creature, young or old, willingly wastes energy on the impossible or the improbable. The grades will never be successful if high-school tasks are assigned, nor can we expect the high school to succeed in college work. Moreover, if a class feel that unusual difficulties are to be presented in a test, they will in most cases cease all preparation, and trust to chance. If the majority have failed in an examination, it would be well to review the questions set by the teacher before a wholesale condemnation of the inaccurate answers of the pupils. Hence the first sign-post on the road to success is: Keep within bounds!

At times there is needed judicious assistance in achieving a happy issue; but it must be given sparingly and be well directed. The shy and diffident, so afraid of attempt and so breathless in experiment, have as a rule, latent capabilities that require a little spur to be set in action. Then, magnifying a difficulty, but at the same time showing the possibility of its solution, makes the contest more enticing; and when success does come the elation is all the greater for there is developed a wholesome confidence in self's power to surmount obstacles.

## PRAISE YE!

**F**IRST, last, and always, must we be appreciative. If something worth while is accomplished, it should receive its full quota of praise. Away then with any misguided zeal to oust all conceit at even the slightest provocation, away with that too great fear that the successful may become too satisfied with self. It is not those who are really qualified that are most vain; in matters intellectual as well as moral it is only the exaggerated opinion of self's sufficiency that is harmful. True worth deserves praise. The greatest of teachers was not loath to give the merited "well done!" What a dismal world this would be, if all panegyrics and eulogies were tabooed! The favorite Scriptural text of the teacher should be that word so frequently found in the songs of one after God's own Heart: *Laudate!* If we want success to come from our efforts as instructors we must cultivate a keen appreciation of work well done. A word of commendation for examples solved quickly and correctly, a favorable comment on the excellence and neatness of an essay, will not only beget in the one praised greater rapidity and accuracy in mathematical tasks, more splendid makeup and style in language lessons, but the rest of the class will be encouraged by a realization that the reward of merit is not absolutely limited to the life to come. To children, this seems a long way off, and is a bit indefinite; they want a part of the hundredfold here. Let them have it.

W. COLEMAN NEVILS, S.J.

## SOCIOLOGY

## Socialist Equality

**E**QUALITY is the ultimate aim of Socialism. Liberty and fraternity are only the presumed characteristics of that future state in which all distinction of classes shall cease to be. The nature of this equality is variously described by Socialist authorities, who notoriously disagree upon every practical application of their theories. The wisest among them refrain from prophecy and merely state that aside from the common ownership of productive property, the nature of the Socialist commonwealth will depend entirely upon the will and vote of the triumphant Socialist faction. The latter in turn, will be guided by expediency in the choice of their measures. Whatever they determine must be regarded as law and justice.

Equality, we are told, does not mean a division and redivision of property among the masses, although a distribution of the land was one of the first proposals made by the victorious Bolsheviks. "The end which true Socialism sets before us is the realization of absolute equality of condition," wrote Bax and

Morris in "The Manifesto of the Socialist League." (p. 10.) The immediate end, however, is now commonly described as equality of opportunity, to be assured under a system in which all the large industries and means of transportation are to be owned, not by individuals, nor by the State, but by the people. "The alpha and omega of Socialism," says Spargo, "is equalization of opportunity." ("Socialism and Motherhood," p. 39.)

#### HISTORICAL EXAMPLES

THE beheading of the nobility was the first step toward equalization taken by the French revolutionists. The confiscation of property toward the enrichment of their leaders was the immediate measure of the Mexican Socialists. The leveling of rank in State and army, the seizure of banks and the immediate or gradual expropriation of the wealthy classes was the practical plan of the Bolshevik organizations. In every historic instance the confiscation of the property of the Church, of her schools and charitable institutions was considered essential. Where Socialism is not triumphant it seeks to obtain this purpose, as far as possible, by urging the taxation of all property devoted to religious purposes. Aside from the animosity toward revealed religion, characterizing the Socialist movement everywhere, without excepting a single nation or period of time, the Church has always been hated and opposed by Socialists as the support of authority and consequently of social inequality. Her very hierarchy, as instituted by Christ, is based upon the idea of authority and obedience.

#### ATTEMPTS AT EQUALIZATION

A BSOLUTE equality is clearly unattainable. It is absurd to hold that under any proposed economic system natural equalities will practically disappear. The more reasonable Socialist writers themselves freely admit this. Hence the importance given to the idea of "equality of opportunity," which Spargo calls the essence of Socialism. Thus it is proposed that every child receive at the very least a primary education in the same Socialist schools. Those who would show marked ability might then be advanced to higher studies. The result would be an élite of education, who by natural abilities and training would rise far above their fellows with the inevitable result of drawing upon themselves that same envy and hatred which is ever at the heart of Socialist movements. There are doubtless many idealists who honestly, though mistakenly, embrace Socialism in protest against the real abuses of wealth and power. They fail as yet to see that these call for a Christian restoration of human brotherhood by the enforcement of just laws, based upon the demands of nature and the Gospel, and not for a false and unnatural Socialist equalization.

The old question, moreover, of the distribution of the agreeable and disagreeable tasks reasserts itself. It is naïvely explained that under Socialism almost every kind of unpleasant work will be performed by machinery, owing to the impetus that will be given to invention in the new era. More practical minds realize that this problem must be fairly met. Some urge that each man should be employed in turn at occupations that are agreeable and disagreeable, at those esteemed more dignified and those that are now deemed less honorable. Factory manager and charwoman might thus change places in turn, since all able-bodied persons of both sexes are to be employed in the service of the commonwealth. Though proposed by leading authorities such solutions are childish and would end in a reign of total inefficiency.

Another solution proposed is to bestow the greatest remuneration upon the humblest and most disagreeable occupations, so that men and women would seek out the latter by preference; or else to shorten the hours of labor according to the unpleasantry of the task that is to be performed. Many finally hold that so high a state of altruism will be reached that men will vie

with one another in desiring the lowliest, most trying, and hardest occupations. This is particularly likely in a materialistic commonwealth such as the Socialist State would be.

#### EFFICIENCY

ONE fact is certain that men are urged to efficiency by the economic remuneration offered them. The higher their hope is raised, or the greater their fear of losing their advantage, the more productive and efficient will they become. The Catholic economic system, which proposes the elimination of the abuses of modern capitalism and of all unfair profit or unjust competition, can alone attain to the highest efficiency and is economically the only perfect system. Socialism, on the other-hand, is as far removed as the most tyrannical capitalism from securing the utmost productivity of labor and the most equitable distribution of rewards. Both would fly in the face of nature and substitute their own artificial laws, which mean wastage in the one instance and inefficiency in the other, and injustice in both cases.

#### SOCIALIST WAGE SYSTEM

TO bring about a condition of equality it was first suggested to pay the laborer, not according to hours of his labor nor according to the quantity and quality of his work, but merely according to his needs. This principle was even incorporated into the Gotha program. "From each one according to his capacity, to each one according to his needs," was accepted as the ideal aim of Socialism in "The Manifesto of the Socialist League" (p. 10). Even an opportunist Socialist, such as Hillquit, sees in this concept the ultimate ideal, which may yet come to be accepted as the working basis of the Socialist State. The absurdity of this rule becomes evident from the fact that the greatest spendthrift will likewise in all probability be the worst idler and most inefficient laborer, yet the highest remuneration would be given to him because he will always be most in need.

Pearson's solution which would make the reward depend on the quantity and quality of the labor contributed to the common stock, is doubtless more just, but the demand for equality is too strong to be withstood. Thus even Spargo proposes an approximate equality of wages. The Socialist ideal would without any doubt leave the smallest margin between the remuneration received by the most highly-efficient specialist and the man or woman engaged in the most unskilled forms of labor. But again it is apparent that a mere nominal difference in remuneration will not stimulate men to attain to the highest productivity or efficiency. Should the required incentives be given they could only lead to new inequalities and to the ancient discontent. Dissatisfaction owing to insufficient wages and other causes would be more acute under the Socialist régime where all freedom of expression would be taken away, since the press would be in the hands of the ruling politicians, as likewise every department that might offer the facility for public remonstrance. Even churches could not be built except at politicians' pleasure, since the work could not be undertaken unless the material were furnished and the laborers detailed by them for this purpose.

#### CHANGING HUMAN NATURE

IT is true that wages or accumulated savings could not be invested so as to produce profit, interest or rent, since the object of Socialism is the abolition of these sources of income. Higher wages could be spent merely in personal luxury and the satisfaction of personal inclinations. Though the present system might for a time be permitted to linger on, it is incompatible with the idea of Socialism. Hence another source of incentive and enterprise would be sealed. We know that Socialists have one answer to all such objections. Human nature, they tell us, will be completely changed under Socialism, so that we cannot at all argue from present experiences. This is nothing but a confession of the absurdity of their position. Human nature

and the fact of original sin and of its consequences have not undergone the slightest changes in the course of history. Men have practised justice and charity in so far as they have been truly religious and for no other reason. Such is the general rule and the universal experience of mankind.

#### LEVELING DOWNWARD

**S**Ocialism, as we made plain in the preceding article on "The Promise of Socialism" (Jan. 12), would of necessity mean longer hours and smaller rewards. The worker is promised that each one can then possess the luxury of his own automobile and the enjoyments for which he now perhaps envies the rich. In fact, however, if there were to be a Socialist equalization, it would be downward and not upward, so that society would not reach the economic position of the wealthy of today but would be leveled to the condition of the impoverished few. The average income of all is not raised so excessively as may be imagined by the exceptional fortunes of the few very wealthy members of society. When their money has been absorbed the average income will of necessity sink still lower, since the waste of the present system will be as nothing compared with the lack of incentive and the slackness and inefficiency that would follow under Socialism. So far from receiving the full price of his product the workingman would receive less than today. As for the loot and booty of Socialist revolutions, it has never yet enriched the people.

#### SOCIALIST AND CHRISTIAN METHODS

**T**HE Catholic system on the other hand proposes a true equality based upon nature and the Word of God. In each man it beholds an image of the Divinity. By just laws it would strive to bring about the widest possible participation on the part of all in the private ownership of productive property and render impossible the acquisition of any undue portion of the nation's wealth by a few greedy capitalists. The Church was able to accomplish this in the days of the gilds. By wise regulations it could again be accomplished in our day without the injustice of Socialism and the misery and certain failure that would be consequent upon it. So talent and energy would not fall short of their full reward while the welfare of the masses would be equally secured. To drive out nature with a pitchfork is the Socialist method; wisely to cooperate with her in conformity with the Divine will of nature's God is the Catholic solution. The world has its choice between the two. It is the difference between a false and a true equality.

JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S.J.

#### NOTE AND COMMENT

##### A Worthy Mission Contribution

**T**HE largest contribution ever offered by a single diocese in the cause of the missions is announced in the annual report of the New York archdiocese, giving the sum of the offerings made by it during the past year to the Catholic foreign missions and to the Society for the Propagation of the Faith. A few modest words of introduction precede the tabulated accounts that close with the announcement of the gross receipts totaling \$239,734.15, or nearly a quarter of a million. Special thanks are given by the director, Mgr. John J. Dunn, and his assistant, the Rev. Joseph F. Bochles, to his Eminence, John Cardinal Farley, "The Cardinal of the Missions," for his generous helpfulness in bringing about these splendid results, "an evidence of a living Catholic faith, which has always distinguished the people of this truly Catholic diocese." The figures are more eloquent than words, and it is to be hoped that they will serve as a stimulus to the Catholics of the entire nation. If each diocese will contribute in proportion to this noble cause, the United States will

soon be able to accomplish wonders for the extension of the Gospel in the foreign mission fields.

#### The Catholic Khaki Testament

**T**HE Chaplains' Aid Association has published a special Army and Navy edition of the New Testament which is the smallest Douay version ever printed in America. An edition of 10,000 copies has already been issued and distributed among the soldiers. To continue this work a New Testament Fund has been established, for which contributions are earnestly solicited. When the project was first proposed the increased cost of labor, paper and binding made it appear an impossible task, since the entire contents of the volume had to be set up in type, proof-read and electrotyped before the book could be printed.

The Protestant bodies, better prepared in the way of pocket editions and with plates, were working day and night running New Testaments off the press that the Protestant enlisted men might have each a copy; the Hebrews were likewise printing and distributing their Scriptures. Should the Catholic Church, the custodian of the Word of God, alone be unable to provide her children with the Testament of Christ's love? The thought was unthinkable. Heroically the Chaplains' Aid set itself to the task. "What must be done can be done," and the event has justified the motto.

So the *Chaplains' Aid Bulletin* describes the beginning of this important work. But the task of financing the free distribution of copies for all our Catholic soldiers and sailors is no slight problem. The suggestion has consequently been made that the pastors supply the men of their respective parishes with free autograph copies "as a constant memorial to the soldier and sailor of him who is his father in God." A special parish fund might readily be created for the purpose of providing the men with a New Testament and likewise with an Army and Navy Prayer Book, if this has not yet found its way into their pocket equipment. The Catholics of the country should adopt as their slogan: A Catholic Testament for every Catholic soldier and sailor.

#### An Insurance for Every Fighter

"**T**HE most just and humane provision ever made by any nation for its soldiers and sailors," is the description of the Government-insurance plan given by Secretary McAdoo. The United States Treasury Department has left no means untried to induce every fighter at the front to avail himself of this opportunity. The success of these efforts may be judged by the fact that the insurance has already passed the third billion mark in the total of policies written. Particular attention is called to this important matter at the present moment since the automatic insurance provided by the law ceases after February 12, 1918. Soldiers and sailors must therefore avail themselves of the opportunity before that date for the sake of their families and dependents and their own peace of mind. The insurance can rise as high as \$10,000 and is payable to wife, husband, child, grandchild, parent, brother or sister. The law also provides for the reeducation and rehabilitation of the totally disabled and allows monthly compensation to those disabled.

#### The Little Foxes That Spoil the Vines

**E**VERY war orator, says the editor of the *Epworth Herald*, has his own favorite slogan. Ships will win the war; coal will win the war; aeroplanes will win the war; food will win the war; dollars will win the war. Rarely are we told that men will win the war. What is the psychology of this fact?

The orator takes it for granted that the country will give up its men; he is not so sure that it will give up its sugar or its leisure or its electric lights. As human nature runs, big sacrifices are easier than small ones. Tommy in the trenches performs miracles of endurance, and then makes bitter complaint if he misses a mouthful of strawberry jam. He was not altogether a heretic who prayed: "Lord, save me from my little faults, and I will take care of the great ones myself." Watch out for the small disobediences, the insignificant weaknesses, the trifling flaws in your daily living. The call to splendid sacrifice will not find you cold, but how about the call to self-denials which nobody will notice? How about the humdrum faithfulness which stirs nobody's blood?

Our greatest opportunities, as he rightly says, are the unnoticed ones. Our subtlest temptations are those that seem insignificant. The little foxes spoil the vines. Unfaithfulness in small things leads to failure in great things.

#### Dates of the World-War Declarations

THE following alphabetical table of the dates at which the various nations now involved in the great struggle issued their declarations of war was compiled for the *Mid-Week Pictorial* by the New York *Times*. Readers of AMERICA will doubtless find it valuable for future reference:

Austria against Belgium, August 28, 1914.  
 Austria against Japan, August 27, 1914.  
 Austria against Montenegro, August 9, 1914.  
 Austria against Russia, August 6, 1914.  
 Austria against Serbia, July 28, 1914.  
 Brazil against Germany, October 26, 1917.  
 Bulgaria against Serbia, October 14, 1915.  
 China against Austria, August 14, 1917.  
 China against Germany, August 14, 1917.  
 Cuba against Germany, April 7, 1917.  
 France against Austria, August 13, 1914.  
 France against Bulgaria, October 16, 1915.  
 France against Germany, August 3, 1914.  
 France against Turkey, November 5, 1914.  
 Germany against Belgium, August 4, 1914.  
 Germany against France, August 3, 1914.  
 Germany against Portugal, March 9, 1916.  
 Germany against Rumania, September 14, 1916.  
 Germany against Russia, August 1, 1914.  
 Great Britain against Austria, August 13, 1914.  
 Great Britain against Bulgaria, October 15, 1915.  
 Great Britain against Germany, August 4, 1914.  
 Great Britain against Turkey, November 5, 1914.  
 Greece against Bulgaria, November 28, 1916 (Provisional Government.)  
 Greece against Bulgaria, July 2, 1917 (Government of Alexander.)  
 Greece against Germany, November 28, 1916 (Provisional Government.)  
 Greece against Germany, July 2, 1917 (Government of Alexander).  
 Italy against Austria, May 24, 1915.  
 Italy against Bulgaria, October 19, 1915.  
 Italy against Germany, August 28, 1916.  
 Italy against Turkey, August 21, 1915.  
 Japan against Germany, August 23, 1914.  
 Liberia against Germany, August 4, 1917.  
 Montenegro against Austria, August 8, 1914.  
 Montenegro against Germany, August 9, 1914.  
 Panama against Germany, April 7, 1917.  
 Portugal against Germany, November 23, 1914 (Resolution passed authorizing military intervention as ally of England.)  
 Portugal against Germany, May 19, 1915 (Military aid granted.)  
 Rumania against Austria, August 27, 1916 (Allies of Austria also consider it a declaration.)  
 Russia against Bulgaria, October 19, 1915.  
 Russia against Turkey, November 3, 1914.  
 San Marino against Austria, May 24, 1915.  
 Serbia against Bulgaria, October 16, 1915.  
 Serbia against Germany, August 9, 1914.  
 Serbia against Turkey, December 2, 1914.  
 Siam against Austria, July 22, 1917.

Siam against Germany, July 22, 1917.  
 Turkey against Allies, November 23, 1914.  
 Turkey against Rumania, August 29, 1916.  
 United States against Austria-Hungary, December 7, 1917.  
 United States against Germany, April 6, 1917.

It is worthy of note that Belgium made no formal declarations of war. Her ruthless invasion by Germany rendered such a measure superfluous. The total population of the Entente Allies, including their colonies, is 1,300,000,000, and that of the Teutonic Allies, likewise including their colonies, is 160,000,000. The former occupy an area of 40,000,000 square miles and the latter of 2,200,000. Printing in black the portions of the map of the world that are now implicated in the war, we find that only a few narrow strips are left, here and there, indicating the territory which still remains neutral ground. The snow-fields of Greenland represent the only considerable tract of land in the Northern Hemisphere that is not embroiled by this gigantic conflict.

#### Paganizing the Philippines

AN appalling spirit of religious indifference is settling upon the Philippines. The rising generation is growing up without religion and without God. "We have in and around Vigan," writes a missionary priest to us, "some fifteen Catechism centers, but you will hardly see at our instructions a single little boy or girl who has reached the third or fourth grade in the public schools." Yet these children are all "Catholics," for Protestantism, we are told, "Can sink no roots in Vigan." Of the high school pupils apparently only a handful show any disinterested zeal for their Faith. Going to a town of about 6,000 inhabitants, on the occasion of a special feast, the missionary found seventeen persons at the first Mass and some 200 at the second and Solemn Mass. Another straw to show the direction in which the wind is now blowing was the statement made to the missionary by a former Catechism teacher, who had joined the National Guard, that his captain had given instruction that the Jones Law forbade the teaching of Catechism. The officer is an ex general of the Philippine revolution. To increase the confusion there are the itinerant preachers making a pure mockery of religion: "Some of these are mere boys of seventeen or twenty years, absolutely ignorant of everything, I may say, except of a few texts from the Bible which they have learned from an American minister. They go forth into the highways and byways preaching, and not infrequently their doctrine is a hodge-podge of heresies." The same may be said of the girl preachers or deaconesses. Is it to such uses that the Protestant mission money is put in the Philippines? The writer continues:

Yesterday I went during morning recess to two different schools and urged all the little fellows, some 200, to be present in the afternoon. Some thirty came, and of them only about half a dozen knew the "Our Father" and the "Hail Mary." Can you picture what the Philippines will be in a few years, when we now behold the present generation growing up, absolutely, I may say, without an idea of God? To this may be added what appears to be a growing contempt or perhaps animosity toward the priesthood. The action of some political leaders may help to foster this. The Protestant propaganda, especially in attacking the priests and striving to undermine their authority, and the indirect influence of the schools, all tend to intensify this spirit.

Even in the Philippine Senate a systematic political attack has been made upon the clergy and upon religious schools, and an insidious attempt is even now under way to supplant the highly efficient weather bureau conducted by the famous Father Algue, S.J. and worse still a bill has been introduced into the Philippine Congress calling for the taxation of churches, the money obtained thereby to be applied to the support of the public schools. Unless mighty efforts are now made to save the country it will fast decline into a godless and atheistic land.